arXiv:1212.6457v1 [math.DG] 28 Dec 2012

Deformation theory of G_2 conifolds

Spiro Karigiannis*

Department of Pure Mathematics, University of Waterloo

`karigiannis@math.uwaterloo.ca`

Jason D. Lotay†

Department of Mathematics, University College London

`j.lotay@ucl.ac.uk`

January 1, 2013

Abstract

We consider the deformation theory of *asymptotically conical* (AC) and of *conically singular* (CS) G_2 manifolds. In the AC case, we show that if the rate of convergence ν to the cone at infinity is generic in a precise sense and lies in the interval $(-4, -\frac{5}{2})$, then the moduli space is smooth and we compute its dimension in terms of topological and analytic data. For generic rates $\nu < -4$ in the AC case, and for generic positive rates of convergence to the cones at the singular points in the CS case, the deformation theory is in general obstructed. We describe the obstruction spaces explicitly in terms of the spectrum of the Laplacian on the link of the cones on the ends, and compute the virtual dimension of the moduli space.

We also present several applications of these results, including: the local uniqueness of the Bryant–Salamon AC G_2 manifolds; the smoothness of the CS moduli space if the singularities are modeled on particular G_2 cones; and the proof of existence of a "good gauge" needed for desingularization of CS G_2 manifolds. Finally, we discuss some open problems for future study.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Preliminaries on G_2 manifolds **5**

2.1 G_2 structures 5

2.2 Parallel tensors on G_2 manifolds 7

2.3 The spinor bundle and the Dirac operator on G_2 manifolds 8

2.4 A gauge-fixing condition on moduli spaces of G_2 manifolds 10

---

[*] Portions of this research were completed while the first author was supported by a Marie Curie Fellowship of the European Commission under contract number MIF1-CT-2006-039113. The contents of this work reflect only the authors' views and not the views of the European Commission.

[†] The second author is currently supported by an EPSRC Career Acceleration Fellowship.

3 G_2 conifolds **13**
3.1 G_2 cones . . . 13
3.2 Asymptotically conical (AC) G_2 manifolds . . . 19
3.3 Conically singular (CS) G_2 manifolds . . . 19

4 Lockhart–McOwen analysis for G_2 conifolds **20**
4.1 Weighted Banach spaces on conifolds . . . 21
4.2 Fredholm and elliptic operators on conifolds . . . 23
4.3 Topological results for conifolds . . . 28
4.4 Two analytic results particular to G_2 conifolds . . . 30

5 The deformation theory of G_2 conifolds **33**
5.1 The G_2 conifold moduli space . . . 33
5.2 Proof of the main theorem . . . 35
5.2.1 Step 1: Hodge theory results for 3-forms and 2-forms . . . 35
5.2.2 Step 2: Gauge-fixing and the slice theorem . . . 39
5.2.3 Step 3: Local one-to-one correspondence with solutions of an elliptic PDE . . 41
5.2.4 Step 4: Applying the Banach space implicit function theorem . . . 43
5.2.5 Step 5: Computing the virtual dimension of the moduli space . . . 49

6 Applications and open problems **56**
6.1 The spectrum of the Laplacian on Gray manifolds . . . 56
6.2 Local uniqueness of the Bryant–Salamon manifolds . . . 60
6.3 Smoothness of the CS moduli space for certain cones . . . 61
6.4 Relation with the moduli of resolved CS G_2 manifolds . . . 62
6.5 Existence of a gauge-fixing diffeomorphism . . . 64
6.6 Open problems . . . 65

1 Introduction

In this paper we study the deformation theory of certain G_2 manifolds that are modeled on cones, which we call *conifolds*. Specifically, we consider the *asymptotically conical* (AC) G_2 manifolds, which are noncompact manifolds of G_2 holonomy with one end that is asymptotic (in an appropriate sense) to a G_2 cone at infinity. We also consider *conically singular* (CS) G_2 manifolds. These are compact topological spaces such that after removing a finite set of points $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ they are noncompact manifolds of G_2 holonomy with n ends that are asymptotic (in an appropriate sense) to n possibly distinct G_2 cones at their vertices. The precise definitions will be given in Section 3.

This paper is a sequel to [18], which studied the *desingularization* of CS G_2 manifolds by gluing in AC G_2 manifolds. We adopt the notation and conventions from [18], and as such it may be useful for the reader of the present paper to begin by familiarizing themselves with Sections 1, 2, and 4 of [18], although we do review all of the important definitions and restate all the results from [18] that are needed to keep the present paper as self-contained as possible.

The main theorem we prove in this paper is the following. The notation and terminology used in this theorem is defined in Section 3 and Section 5.1.

Main Theorem (Theorem 5.1) *Let (M, φ) be a* G_2 *conifold, asymptotic to particular* G_2 *cones on the ends, at some rate ν. Let $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ be the moduli space of all torsion-free* G_2 *structures on M, asymptotic to the same cones on the ends, at the same rate ν, modulo the appropriate notion of equivalence that preserves these conditions. Then for generic ν (in a sense made precise later), we have*

- *In the AC case, if $\nu \in (-4, -\frac{5}{2})$, the space $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is a* smooth manifold *whose dimension consists of topological and analytic contributions, given precisely in Corollary 5.38.*
- *In the AC case if $\nu < -4$, or in the CS case for any $\nu > 0$, the space $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is in general only a* topological space*, and the deformation theory may be obstructed. The virtual dimension again consists of topological and analytic contributions, given precisely in Corollary 5.38.*

Perhaps even more interesting than our main theorem are its several corollaries, which are stated precisely in Section 6. In particular, we use Theorem 5.1 to prove the local uniqueness of the Bryant–Salamon AC G_2 manifolds; to argue that CS G_2 manifolds with particular types of conical singularities have unobstructed deformations; and to relate the moduli space of CS G_2 manifolds to the moduli space of the compact smooth G_2 manifolds obtained by the desingularization construction in [18]. This last observation gives evidence of the likelihood that CS G_2 manifolds are the dominant contributor to the "boundary" of the moduli space of compact smooth G_2 manifolds.

The deformation theory of CS or AC manifolds in the context of special holonomy and calibrated geometry has been studied by Joyce in [13] for CS special Lagrangian submanifolds, by Marshall [29] and Pacini [39] for AC special Lagrangian submanifolds of $\mathbb{C}^m$, and by the second author [24, 25, 26, 27] for coassociative AC and CS submanifolds and associative AC submanifolds of G_2 manifolds. Nordström [36] considered the deformation theory of *asymptotically cylindrical* G_2 manifolds. Finally, Pacini [40, 41, 42] has a series of papers on the analysis of special Lagrangian conifolds, allowing for a mixture of both AC and CS ends.

We consider only deformations of G_2 conifolds that are asymptotic to *fixed* G_2 cones on the ends. The reason for this is that the link of a G_2 cone is a compact *nearly Kähler* 6-manifold, also known as a *Gray manifold*. The infinitesimal deformations of Gray manifolds were considered by Moroianu–Nagy–Semmelmann in [32], but there is no evidence that such objects have smooth, unobstructed deformations. Indeed, there are at present still only three known examples of Gray manifolds, other than the round S^6, all of which are homogeneous.

To describe the deformation theory of G_2 conifolds, we essentially follow the approach of Joyce [11], who considered the deformation theory of *compact* G_2 manifolds. However, almost all of the steps in his proof use compactness in a crucial way, so we need to make nontrivial extensions to establish our results in this noncompact setting.

One technical issue is that we use weighted Banach spaces of sections that decay at some rate λ on the ends of the manifold, but these Banach spaces are *not* always subspaces of L^2. Indeed, the rate at which the transition occurs between being in L^2 or not, specifically $\lambda = -\frac{7}{2}$, lies *precisely between* the rates -4 and -3 that together encompass all known examples of AC G_2 manifolds. As a result, we need to delicately work right on the edge of where certain analytic results actually hold, and in several cases we need to find subtle ways to push these results to limits that are further than they may initially seem to go. This is in contrast, for example, to the asymptotically cylindrical case where one can always essentially work with L^2 sections. Another issue is that in the non-L^2 case, we are forced to use the *Dirac operator* on G_2 manifolds to prove our "slice theorem". This is similar to Nordström [36]. Finally, the noncompactness of the manifolds (and thus the nonavailability of classical Hodge theory) makes it more natural to consider the Fredholm theory of the operator $d+d^*$ rather than the Laplacian Δ to study the moduli space. Some of the issues highlighted here are purely analytic technical problems but others are geometrically relevant.

We now discuss the organization of our paper. Section 2 reviews some aspects of G_2 geometry that we require, including the spinor bundle and the Dirac operator for G_2 manifolds; facts about parallel 1-forms on G_2 manifolds; and various results concerning our gauge-fixing condition on moduli spaces. More details about G_2 structures can be found in Bryant [5] and Joyce [11]. Section 3 is a review of some of the material from [18] about G_2 conifolds, and also includes some new material on analytic aspects of the Dirac operator on G_2 cones that we require. In Section 4, we briefly review and summarize the relevant results that we need from the Lockhart–McOwen theory of weighted Sobolev spaces on conifolds. In Section 5 we consider the deformation theory of G_2 conifolds, and prove our main theorem. Finally, in Section 6 we present applications of our results and discuss some open problems.

For completeness, we explicitly state here the Banach space implicit function theorem that we will use. Its proof can be found, for example, in Lang [21, Theorem 6.2.1]. The hats on $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\widehat{F}$ are employed to match notation with the eventual use of this theorem in Section 5.2.4.

Theorem 1.1 (Banach space implicit function theorem)**.** *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be Banach spaces, and let $\widehat{\mathcal{U}} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be an open neighbourhood of* 0. *Let $\widehat{F} : \widehat{\mathcal{U}} \to \mathcal{Y}$ be a C^k-map (with $k \geq 1$) such that $\widehat{F}(0) = 0$. Suppose that the differential $D\widehat{F}|_0 : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ is* surjective, *with kernel $\mathcal{K}$ such that $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{K} \oplus \mathcal{Z}$ for some* closed *subspace $\mathcal{Z}$ of $\mathcal{X}$. Then there exist open sets $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$, both containing* 0, *with $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, and a* unique *$C^k$-map $G : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{W}$ such that*

$$\widehat{F}^{-1}(0) \cap (\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W}) \; = \; \{(x, G(x));\, x \in \mathcal{V}\}$$

in $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{K} \oplus \mathcal{Z}$. That is, the zero set of $\widehat{F}$ near the origin in $\mathcal{X}$ is parametrized by a neighbourhood of the origin in the space $\mathcal{K}$.

Conventions

We use single vertical bars $|\cdot|$ or angle braces $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ for a *pointwise* inner product on sections of some vector bundle, and we use double vertical bars $||\cdot||$ or angle braces $\langle\langle\cdot,\cdot,\rangle\rangle$ for a global (L^2) inner product on sections.

Since all of our manifolds are Riemannian, we often use the metric g to identify vector fields and 1-forms. This will always be clear by the context.

There are two sign conventions in G_2 geometry. The convention we choose is the one used in Bryant–Salamon [6] and in Harvey–Lawson [10], but differs from the convention used in Bryant [5] or Joyce [11]. A detailed discussion of sign conventions and orientations in G_2 geometry can be found in the first author's note [16].

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Benoit Charbonneau, Dominic Joyce, Johannes Nordström, Uwe Semmelmann, and Nico Spronk for useful discussions.

2 Preliminaries on G_2 manifolds

2.1 G_2 structures

A G_2 structure on a smooth 7-manifold M is a smooth 3-form φ satisfying a certain "nondegeneracy" condition. Various approaches to describing this nondegeneracy condition can be found, for example, in [5, 11, 17] but we will not explicitly need these. A G_2 structure φ determines a Riemannian metric g_φ and an orientation vol_φ in a nonlinear way. Thus φ determines a Hodge star operator $*_\varphi$, and $\psi = *_\varphi \varphi$ is the dual 4-form. When a G_2 structure exists, there is an open subbundle Ω^3_+ of the bundle of 3-forms consisting of nondegenerate 3-forms, also called *positive* or *stable* 3-forms.

Definition 2.1. A G_2 manifold is a connected manifold with a G_2 structure (M, φ) such that φ is *parallel* with respect to the Levi-Civita connection ∇ determined by g_φ. That is, $\nabla_{g_\varphi} \varphi = 0$. Such a G_2 structure is also called *torsion-free.* In this case the Riemannian holonomy $\mathrm{Hol}_{g_\varphi}(M)$ of (M, g_φ) is contained in the group $\mathrm{G}_2 \subseteq \mathrm{SO}(7)$.

Remark 2.2. A G_2 manifold is always *Ricci-flat*, and a G_2 structure φ is torsion-free if and only if it is both closed and coclosed: $d\varphi = 0$ and $d\psi = 0$.

On a manifold with G_2 structure, there is a decomposition into representations of G_2 of the bundle Ω^k of k-forms. The bundle Ω^3 of 3-forms decomposes as

$$\Omega^3 = \Omega^3_1 \oplus \Omega^3_7 \oplus \Omega^3_{27} \tag{1}$$

into irreducible G_2 representations. Similarly we have a decomposition of the space Ω^2 as

$$\Omega^2 = \Omega^2_7 \oplus \Omega^2_{14}, \tag{2}$$

and isomorphic splittings of Ω^4 and Ω^5 given by the Hodge star of the above decompositions: $\Omega^k_l = *_\varphi(\Omega^{7-k}_l)$. The bundle Ω^k_l has fibre dimension l and these decompositions of Ω^k are orthogonal with respect to the metric g_φ. The explicit descriptions of these spaces that we will need are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega^2_7 &= \{*(\alpha \wedge \psi);\, \alpha \in \Omega^1\} = \{\beta \in \Omega^2;\, *(\varphi \wedge \beta) = -2\beta\}, && (3)\\
\Omega^2_{14} &= \{\beta \in \Omega^2;\, \beta \wedge \psi = 0\} = \{\beta \in \Omega^2;\, *(\varphi \wedge \beta) = \beta\}, && (4)\\
\Omega^3_1 &= \{f\varphi;\, f \in \Omega^0\}, && (5)\\
\Omega^3_7 &= \{*(\alpha \wedge \varphi);\, \alpha \in \Omega^1\}, && (6)\\
\Omega^3_{27} &= \{\eta \in \Omega^3;\, \eta \wedge \varphi = 0 \text{ and } \eta \wedge \psi = 0\}. && (7)
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.3. One can thus decompose $d\varphi = \pi_1(d\varphi) + \pi_7(d\varphi) + \pi_{27}(d\varphi)$ and $d\psi = \pi_7(d\psi) + \pi_{14}(d\psi)$ for any G_2 structure. It is a nontrivial but well known fact that $\pi_7(d\varphi)$ vanishes if and only if $\pi_7(d\psi)$ vanishes. See, for example, [17] for a direct verification of this fact. In particular, the implication of this that we will require is that for a *closed* G_2 structure, we have $d\psi \in \Omega^5_{14}$.

Remark 2.4. When the G_2 structure is torsion-free, these decompositions of the spaces of forms are preserved by the Hodge Laplacian $\Delta = dd^* + d^*d$. The essential aspect of this fact that we will need is the following. Suppose f is any function and X is any 1-form on a G_2 manifold M. Then

$$\Delta(f\varphi) = (\Delta f)\varphi, \qquad \Delta(f\psi) = (\Delta f)\psi, \tag{8}$$

$$\Delta(X \wedge \varphi) = (\Delta X) \wedge \varphi, \qquad \Delta(X \wedge \psi) = (\Delta X) \wedge \psi. \tag{9}$$

The identities in (8) can be proved using just the fact that φ and ψ are parallel, while the identities in (9) also require the fact that G_2 manifolds have vanishing Ricci curvature.

The next two propositions are results about the decompositions of 2-forms and 3-forms in the torsion-free case.

Proposition 2.5. *Let φ be a torsion-free G_2 structure and suppose $\mu \in \Omega^2_{14}$ is coclosed: $d^*\mu = 0$. Then $d\mu \in \Omega^3_{27}$.*

Proof. By equation (4) the condition $\mu \in \Omega^2_{14}$ is equivalent to each of the following conditions:

$$\mu \wedge \psi \;=\; 0, \qquad\qquad \mu \wedge \varphi \;=\; *\mu.$$

Taking the exterior derivative of these equations and using $d\varphi = 0$, $d\psi = 0$, and $d * \mu = *(d^*\mu) = 0$, we find

$$(d\mu) \wedge \psi \;=\; 0, \qquad\qquad (d\mu) \wedge \varphi \;=\; 0.$$

The conclusion now follows from (7). □

Proposition 2.6. *Let φ be a torsion-free G_2 structure and suppose $\eta \in \Omega^3_{27}$. Then $\pi_7(d\eta) = 0$ if and only if $\pi_7(d^*\eta) = 0$.*

Proof. This is justified in [5] using representation theory. Here we present an explicit computational proof using the local coordinate identities for G_2 structures and the descriptions of Ω^3_{27} that can be found in [17]. In particular we will repeatedly use identities for contractions of φ with itself given in the appendix of [17]. A 3-form η of type Ω^3_{27} corresponds uniquely to a symmetric traceless 2-tensor h on M, with the correspondence given in local coordinates (using the summation convention) by

$$\eta_{ijk} = h_{ip} g^{pq} \varphi_{qjk} + h_{jp} g^{pq} \varphi_{qki} + h_{kp} g^{pq} \varphi_{qij}.$$

A short computation now gives

$$h_{ia} = \frac{1}{4} \varphi_{ijk} \eta_{abc} g^{jb} g^{kc}. \tag{10}$$

Next, we note that $\pi_7(d^*\eta) = 0$ if and only if $\langle d^*\eta, Y \lrcorner \varphi \rangle = 0$ for all vector fields Y, which in local coordinates becomes

$$\pi_7(d^*\eta) = 0 \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad g^{pq} (\nabla_p \eta_{qjk}) \varphi_{abc} g^{jb} g^{kc} = 0 \;\text{ for all } a. \tag{11}$$

Similarly, we have $\pi_7(d\eta) = 0$ if and only if $\langle d\eta, Y \wedge \varphi \rangle = 0$ for all vector fields Y. Using the fact that $\eta \in \Omega^3_{27}$, which implies that $\eta_{ijk} \varphi_{abc} g^{ia} g^{jb} g^{kc} = 0$, in local coordinates this condition becomes

$$\pi_7(d\eta) = 0 \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad g^{pq} (\nabla_p \eta_{ijk}) \varphi_{qbc} g^{jb} g^{kc} = 0 \;\text{ for all } i. \tag{12}$$

Substituting equation (10) into (11) and (12) show that both conditions are equivalent to $g^{pq} \nabla_p h_{qk} =$ for all k. That is, the *divergence* of the symmetric traceless 2-tensor h must vanish. □

We close this section with a discussion of the nonlinear map $\Theta : \Omega^3_+ \to \Omega^4$ which associates to any G_2 structure φ, the dual 4-form $\psi = \Theta(\varphi) = *_\varphi \varphi$ with respect to the metric g_φ associated to φ. One result which will be crucial is the following. This is Proposition 10.3.5 in Joyce [11], adapted to suit our present purposes.

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose that φ is a torsion-free G_2 structure with induced metric g_φ, and dual 4-form $\psi = *_\varphi \varphi$. Let η be a 3-form which has sufficiently small C^0 norm with respect to g_φ, so that $\varphi + \eta$ is still nondegenerate. Then we have*

$$\Theta(\varphi + \eta) \,=\, \psi + *_\varphi \left(\frac{4}{3}\pi_1(\eta) + \pi_7(\eta) - \pi_{27}(\eta) \right) + Q_\varphi(\eta), \tag{13}$$

where π_k is the projection onto the subspace Ω^3_k with respect to the G_2 structure φ. The nonlinear map $Q_\varphi : \Omega^3 \to \Omega^4$ satisfies

$$Q_\varphi(0) = 0, \qquad |Q_\varphi(\eta)| \leq C|\eta|^2, \qquad |\nabla Q_\varphi(\eta)| \leq C|\eta||\nabla\eta|, \tag{14}$$

for some $C > 0$, where the norms and the covariant derivatives are taken with respect to g_φ.

We will denote the second term on the right hand side of (13), which is the term *linear* in η, by $L_\varphi(\eta)$. That is,

$$L_\varphi(\eta) \,=\, *_\varphi \left(\frac{4}{3}\pi_1(\eta) + \pi_7(\eta) - \pi_{27}(\eta) \right). \tag{15}$$

The map $L_\varphi : \Omega^3 \to \Omega^4$ is the linearization of the nonlinear map Θ at φ, and is thus the key ingredient for understanding the infinitesimal deformations of torsion-free G_2 structures.

Suppose that φ is a torsion-free G_2 structure, so that in particular it is coclosed: $d\psi = 0$. Take the exterior derivative of (13) to obtain:

$$d(\Theta(\varphi + \eta)) \,=\, d(L_\varphi(\eta)) + d(Q_\varphi(\eta))$$

and hence

$$*_\varphi \, d(\Theta(\varphi + \eta)) \,=\, -d^* *_\varphi (L_\varphi(\eta)) - d^* *_\varphi (Q_\varphi(\eta)). \tag{16}$$

We will use (16) in Section 5.2.3 when we establish a one-to-one correspondence between torsion-free “gauge-fixed” G_2 structures and solutions to a nonlinear partial differential equation.

2.2 Parallel tensors on G_2 manifolds

The holonomy $H(\nabla)$ of a connection ∇ on the tangent bundle TM of a connected manifold M is the subgroup of the general linear group whose action fixes all parallel tensors on M. See, for example, Joyce [11, Chapter 2] for more details. In particular, the holonomy of the Levi-Civita connection on an oriented Riemannian manifold M^n is reduced from $\mathrm{SO}(n)$ by each additional parallel tensor. On an irreducible G_2 manifold (one whose holonomy is exactly G_2) the only parallel tensors are the metric g, the volume form vol, the G_2 structure φ, and the dual 4-form $\psi = *\varphi$. For our purposes, the G_2 conifolds that we consider are all irreducible, and hence admit no nontrivial parallel 1-forms.

We now recall the Bochner–Weitzenböck formula, valid for any Riemannian manifold (M, g). Let X be a 1-form. Then

$$\langle \Delta X, X \rangle \,=\, \langle \nabla^* \nabla X, X \rangle + \mathrm{Ric}(X, X)$$

where Δ is the Hodge Laplacian, ∇ is the Levi-Civita covariant derivative, and Ric is the Ricci tensor of (M, g), with indices raised by the metric to become a symmetric bilinear form on 1-forms. Since G_2 manifolds are all Ricci-flat, the last term above vanishes. When the two remaining functions on either side of the above equation are integrable on M (such as in, but not limited to, the case when M is compact), we find that

$$\int_M \langle \Delta X, X\rangle \mathsf{vol} \;=\; \int_M \langle \nabla^* \nabla X, X\rangle \mathsf{vol}.$$

In particular, if ∇X is in $L^2(T^*M \otimes T^*M)$, then we can say that

$$\int_M \langle \Delta X, X\rangle \mathsf{vol} \;=\; \int_M \langle \nabla^* \nabla X, X\rangle \mathsf{vol} \;=\; \int_M \langle \nabla X, \nabla X\rangle \mathsf{vol} \;=\; ||\nabla X||^2_{L^2}. \tag{17}$$

Corollary 2.8. *Let M be an* irreducible G_2 *manifold. Let X be a harmonic 1-form. If ∇X is in L^2, then $X = 0$. Similarly if f is a harmonic function on M and ∇f is in L^2 then f is constant.*

Proof. If $\Delta X = 0$ and ∇X is in L^2, then equation (17) shows that $\nabla X = 0$, so X is a parallel 1-form. But the hypothesis that M is an *irreducible* G_2 manifold then implies that $X = 0$. The statement about functions follows in the same way by integrating the equation $\langle \Delta f, f\rangle = \langle \nabla^* \nabla f, f\rangle$ with no assumption about irreducibility needed. □

2.3 The spinor bundle and the Dirac operator on G_2 manifolds

A manifold M with G_2 structure is always a spin manifold, and therefore admits an associated *Dirac* operator $\not{D}$ on its spinor bundle $\not{S}(M)$. When the G_2 structure is torsion-free this Dirac operator squares to exactly the Hodge Laplacian. These facts are explained in detail in the first author's note [16]. Here we only review the facts that are needed in the present paper. The G_2 structure φ is always understood to be torsion-free in this section. Also, we will make repeated use of the identities relating the interior product, the wedge product, and the star operator for G_2 structures, which can be found in [15, Lemma 2.23]. (Note that since we are using the opposite orientation convention from [15], equation (2.13) in that paper should have a factor of -2 instead of $+2$.)

Definition 2.9. We define the *curl* of a vector field X to be the vector field $\operatorname{curl} X$ given by

$$\operatorname{curl} X \;=\; *(dX \wedge \psi) \tag{18}$$

In other words, up to G_2-equivariant isomorphisms, the vector field $\operatorname{curl} X$ is the projection onto the Ω^2_7 component of the 2-form dX.

There is a natural identification of the spinor bundle $\not{S}(M)$, a rank 8 real vector bundle, with the bundle $\mathbb{R} \oplus TM$ whose sections lie in $\Omega^0_1 \oplus \Omega^1_7$.

Definition 2.10. The *Dirac operator* $\not{D}$ is a first order differential operator from $\not{S}(M)$ to $\not{S}(M)$ defined as follows. Let $s = (f, X)$ be a section of $\not{S}(M)$. Then

$$\not{D}(f, X) \;=\; (d^* X\,,\, df + \operatorname{curl} X). \tag{19}$$

The Dirac operator is *formally self-adjoint*: $\not{D}^* = \not{D}$.

We now relate the *Dirac Laplacian* $\not{D}^* \not{D} = \not{D}^2$ to the Hodge Laplacian Δ.

Proposition 2.11. *The Dirac Laplacian $\not{D}^2$ and the Hodge Laplacian Δ are equal:*

$$\not{D}^2(f, X) \;=\; (\Delta f, \Delta X). \tag{20}$$

Remark 2.12. Proposition 2.11 is proved in [16]. The facts that are needed are that $d^*(\operatorname{curl} Y) = 0$ for any vector field Y, that $\operatorname{curl}(df) = 0$ for any function f, and that $\operatorname{curl}(\operatorname{curl} Y) = -dd^*Y + \Delta Y = d^*dY$ for any vector field (1-form) Y. These facts will be important in Proposition 2.13 below.

For our present purposes, we actually require a slight *modification* of the Dirac operator as follows. The spinor bundle $\not{S}(M)$ is isomorphic to $\Omega^0_1 \oplus \Omega^1_7$ and hence, via the usual G_2-equivariant isomorphism, it is also isomorphic to $\Omega^3_1 \oplus \Omega^3_7$. Now consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \breve{\not{D}} : &\quad \Omega^0_1 \oplus \Omega^1_7 \to \Omega^3_1 \oplus \Omega^3_7 \\ \breve{\not{D}} : &\quad (f, X) \mapsto *(df \wedge \varphi) - \pi_{1+7}(d(X \lrcorner \varphi)) \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where π_{1+7} denotes orthogonal projection onto $\Omega^3_1 \oplus \Omega^3_7$. This is a first order linear differential operator. Using the G_2-equivariant isomorphism that identifies the codomain of $\breve{\not{D}}$ with $\Omega^0_1 \oplus \Omega^1_7$, we can compare this operator $\breve{\not{D}}$ with the usual Dirac operator $\not{D}$ from Definition 2.10. The result is summarized in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.13. *The "modified Dirac operator" $\breve{\not{D}}$ of equation* (21)*, when considered as a linear operator on $\Omega^0_1 \oplus \Omega^1_7$ via the G_2-equivariant isomorphism*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^0_1 \oplus \Omega^1_7 \;&\cong\; \Omega^3_1 \oplus \Omega^3_7 \\ (f, X) \;&\leftrightarrow\; (f\varphi, *(X \wedge \varphi)) \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

is the operator

$$\breve{\not{D}} : \quad (f, X) \mapsto \left(\frac{3}{7} d^*X,\, df - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{curl} X \right). \tag{23}$$

Furthermore, the adjoint $\breve{\not{D}}^* : \Omega^0_1 \oplus \Omega^1_7 \to \Omega^0_1 \oplus \Omega^1_7$ of the modified Dirac operator is given by

$$\breve{\not{D}}^* : \quad (h, Y) \mapsto \left(d^*Y,\, \frac{3}{7} dh - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{curl} Y \right). \tag{24}$$

Finally, considered as operators on $\Omega^0_1 \oplus \Omega^1_7$, we have that

$$\breve{\not{D}}^2(f, X) \;=\; (\breve{\not{D}}^*)^2(f, X) \;=\; \left(\frac{3}{7} \Delta f \,,\, \frac{3}{7} dd^*X + \frac{1}{4} d^*dX \right). \tag{25}$$

Since $\breve{\not{D}}^2$ is clearly elliptic, it follows that both $\breve{\not{D}}$ and $\breve{\not{D}}^*$ are also elliptic.

Proof. From the isomorphism (22), we verify the df term in (23). To verify the two terms involving X, we need to compute π_1 and π_7 of $-d(X \lrcorner \varphi)$. We have

$$-\pi_1(d(X \lrcorner \varphi)) \;=\; h\varphi \quad \text{for some } h \in \Omega^0_1(M).$$

Using the fact that $\Omega^3_7(M) \oplus \Omega^3_{27}(M)$ lies in the kernel of wedge product with ψ, we compute

$$d((X \lrcorner \varphi) \wedge \psi) \;=\; d(X \lrcorner \varphi) \wedge \psi \;=\; \pi_1(d(X \lrcorner \varphi)) \wedge \psi \;=\; -h\varphi \wedge \psi \;=\; -7h\mathsf{vol}.$$

Hence, we find that

$$d(3 * X) \;=\; d((X \lrcorner \varphi) \wedge \psi) \;=\; -7h\mathsf{vol},$$

and thus $h = -\frac{3}{7} * d(*X) = \frac{3}{7} d^* X$. Similarly, we have

$$-\pi_7(d(X \lrcorner \varphi)) \, = \, *(Y \wedge \varphi) \quad \text{for some } Y \in \Omega^1_7(M).$$

Using the fact that $\Omega^3_1(M) \oplus \Omega^3_{27}(M)$ lies in the kernel of wedge product with φ, we compute

$$d((X \lrcorner \varphi) \wedge \varphi) \, = \, d(X \lrcorner \varphi) \wedge \varphi \, = \, \pi_7(d(X \lrcorner \varphi)) \wedge \varphi \, = \, - * (Y \wedge \varphi) \wedge \varphi \, = \, 4 * Y.$$

Hence, we find that

$$4 * Y \, = \, d((X \lrcorner \varphi) \wedge \varphi) \, = \, d(-2 * (X \lrcorner \varphi)) \, = \, -2 d(X \wedge \psi) \, = \, -2(dX) \wedge \psi,$$

and thus $Y = -\frac{1}{2} * ((dX) \wedge \psi) = -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{curl} X$. This completes the verification of (23). Equation (24) follows immediately from a simple calculation. For (25), we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\breve{\not{D}}^2(f, X) = \; & \breve{\not{D}} \left(\frac{3}{7} d^* X, df - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{curl} X \right) \\
= \; & \left(\frac{3}{7} d^* \left(df - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{curl} X \right) \, , \, d \left(\frac{3}{7} d^* X \right) - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{curl} \left(df - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{curl} X \right) \right) \\
= \; & \left(\frac{3}{7} d^* df + 0 \, , \, \frac{3}{7} dd^* X + 0 + \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{curl}(\operatorname{curl} X) \right) \\
= \; & \left(\frac{3}{7} \Delta f \, , \, \frac{3}{7} dd^* X + \frac{1}{4} d^* dX \right).
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Remark 2.12. Computing $(\breve{\not{D}}^*)^2$ just interchanges the factors of 1 and $\frac{3}{7}$ in the above calculation, with the same final result. The ellipticity of $\breve{\not{D}}^2$ is immediate from the fact that the coefficients of $dd^* X$ and $d^* dX$ have the same sign. ☐

Corollary 2.14. *Suppose that* $s = (f, X)$ *lies in the kernel of* $\breve{\not{D}}$ *or* $\breve{\not{D}}^*$. *Then* $\Delta f = 0$ *and* $\Delta X = 0$.

Proof. Suppose that $\breve{\not{D}} s = (0, 0)$ or $\breve{\not{D}}^* s = (0, 0)$. From equation (23) or (24) we have $d^* X = 0$. Since we also have $\breve{\not{D}}^2(s) = 0$, equation (25) tells us that $\Delta f = 0$ and $\frac{3}{7} dd^* X + \frac{1}{4} d^* dX = 0$. This equation for X together with $d^* X = 0$ implies that $\Delta X = 0$. ☐

Corollary 2.15. *Let* $\mu = X \lrcorner \varphi = *(X \wedge \psi) \in \Omega^2_7$. *Then* $\pi_1(d\mu) = 0$ *if and only if* $d^* X = 0$*; and* $\pi_7(d\mu) = 0$ *if and only if* $\operatorname{curl} X = 0$.

Proof. In the proof of Proposition 2.13, we showed $\pi_1(d\mu) = -\frac{3}{7} d^* X$ and $\pi_7(d\mu) = \frac{1}{2} * (\operatorname{curl} X \wedge \varphi)$. The result follows since wedge product with φ is injective on 1-forms. ☐

2.4 A gauge-fixing condition on moduli spaces of G_2 manifolds

In this section we discuss a gauge-fixing condition on moduli spaces of G_2 manifolds and some related results. Let (M, φ) be a G_2 manifold, which is *not* necessarily compact. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the space of all torsion-free G_2 structures on M. Then the space $\mathcal{D}$ of diffeomorphisms of M acts on $\mathcal{T}$ by pullback. If $F \in \mathcal{D}$, then

$$F : \varphi \mapsto F^* \varphi.$$

Consider a smooth curve $F_t = \exp(tX)$ in $\mathcal{D}$, where X is a smooth vector field on M. This path passes through the identity diffeomorphism $F_0 = \mathrm{Id}_M$ at $t = 0$. Therefore, the tangent space $T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}\cdot\varphi)$ at φ to the orbit $\mathcal{D}\cdot\varphi$ is spanned by elements of the form $\frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0}(F_t^*\varphi) = \mathcal{L}_X\varphi = d(X\lrcorner\varphi)$. Thus we have

$$T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}\cdot\varphi) \,=\, d(\Omega^2_7). \tag{26}$$

Let $\tilde{\varphi}$ be another torsion-free G_2 structure on M, such that $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi + \eta$ for some smooth 3-form η. Since both φ and $\tilde{\varphi}$ are torsion-free and thus closed, we must have $d\eta = 0$. In order to break the diffeomorphism invariance, we want to consider those new G_2 structures for which $\tilde{\varphi} - \varphi = \eta$ is *transverse* to the infinitesimal diffeomorphisms which, as explained above, are all of the form $\mathcal{L}_X\varphi = d(X\lrcorner\varphi)$ for a smooth vector field X. Suppose that η lies in $L^2(\Lambda^3(T^*M))$. Then the condition that η is actually L^2-orthogonal to $d(\Omega^2_7)$ is that

$$0 \,=\, \langle\langle d(X\lrcorner\varphi), \eta\rangle\rangle \,=\, \langle\langle X\lrcorner\varphi, d^*\eta\rangle\rangle.$$

Notice that this condition is always implied by the stronger condition that $\pi_7(d^*\eta) = 0$ *pointwise.* This observation leads us to the following definition.

Definition 2.16. Suppose $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi + \eta$ is another torsion-free G_2 structure on M, for some closed 3-form η. We say that $\tilde{\varphi}$ satisfies the *gauge-fixing condition* (with respect to φ) if

$$\pi_7(d^*\eta) \,=\, 0.$$

In fact, we will always have $\eta = \kappa + \zeta$ for some closed and coclosed form κ. So our gauge-fixing condition will be $\pi_7(d^*\zeta) = 0$. The next two results relate this gauge-fixing condition to a slightly different condition.

Lemma 2.17. *Let ζ be a smooth 3-form such that $d\zeta = 0$ and $\pi_7(d^*\zeta) = 0$. Let*

$$\zeta \,=\, \pi_1\zeta + \pi_7\zeta + \pi_{27}\zeta \,=\, f\varphi + *(X\wedge\varphi) + \pi_{27}\zeta \tag{27}$$

for some function f and some 1-form X. If both ∇f and ∇X are in L^2 and M is irreducible, then we have $f = c$ is constant and $X = 0$, so $\zeta = c\varphi + \pi_{27}\zeta$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.5 and the hypothesis $d^*\zeta \in \Omega^2_{14}$, we have $dd^*\zeta \in \Omega^3_{27}$. The other hypothesis $d\zeta = 0$ now gives $\Delta\zeta = dd^*\zeta + d^*d\zeta \in \Omega^3_{27}$, so $\pi_1(\Delta\zeta) = 0$ and $\pi_7(\Delta\zeta) = 0$. Since φ is torsion-free, the Laplacian Δ commutes with the projections, so we have $\Delta(\pi_1\zeta) = 0$ and $\Delta(\pi_7\zeta) = 0$. But $\pi_1(\zeta) = f\varphi$ and $\pi_7\zeta = *(X\wedge\varphi)$, so equations (8) and (9) yield that $\Delta f = 0$ and $\Delta X = 0$, where we have used the fact that wedge product with ψ is injective on 1-forms and that $*$ commutes with Δ. The result now follows immediately from Corollary 2.8. □

Lemma 2.18. *Let ζ be a smooth 3-form such that $d\zeta = 0$. Let*

$$\zeta \,=\, \pi_1\zeta + \pi_7\zeta + \pi_{27}\zeta \,=\, f\varphi + *(X\wedge\varphi) + \pi_{27}\zeta \tag{28}$$

for some function f and some 1-form X. If $df = 0$ and $\operatorname{curl} X = 0$, then we have $\pi_7(d^*\zeta) = 0$.

Proof. We begin with the claim that $\operatorname{curl} X = 0$ if and only if $\pi_7(d\pi_7\zeta) = 0$. To see this, we observe that $\pi_7(d\pi_7\zeta) = 0$ if and only if, for all vector fields Y, we have

$$0 \,=\, \langle d(\pi_7\zeta), Y\wedge\varphi\rangle \,=\, \langle d*(X\wedge\varphi), Y\wedge\varphi\rangle \,=\, -\langle d(X\lrcorner\psi), Y\wedge\varphi\rangle.$$

In local coordinates, using the fact that ψ is parallel and that d is the skew-symmetrization of ∇, this condition can be shown to be equivalent to

$$0 = (\nabla_a X^p)\psi_{pbcd}(Y_i\varphi_{jkl} - Y_j\varphi_{ikl} + Y_k\varphi_{ijl} - Y_l\varphi_{ijk})g^{ai}g^{bj}g^{ck}g^{dl}.$$

Using the identities in the appendix of [17] for the contractions of φ with ψ, this simplifies to

$$0 = 12(\nabla^i X^p)\varphi_{ipb}Y^b.$$

But the above equation holds for any Y if and only if $\operatorname{curl} X = 0$, since $(\operatorname{curl} X)_b = (\nabla^i X^p)\varphi_{ipb}$. Thus the claim is proved.

Now because $df = 0$, we have $d(\pi_1\zeta) = 0$, and thus $d\zeta = d(\pi_7\zeta) + d(\pi_{27}\zeta) = 0$. Projecting to Ω^4_7, we find that $\pi_7 d(\pi_{27}\zeta) = -\pi_7 d(\pi_7\zeta) = 0$. Proposition 2.6 now tells us that $\pi_7(d^*\pi_{27}\zeta) = 0$. Since $f = c$ is a constant, we have $d^*(\pi_1\zeta) = 0$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_7(d^*\zeta) &= \pi_7 d^*(\pi_7\zeta) + \pi_7 d^*(\pi_{27}\zeta) = -\pi_7 * d * (*(X \wedge \varphi)) + 0\\ &= - * \pi_7(dX \wedge \varphi).\end{aligned}$$

However from (3) we have that $*\pi_7(dX \wedge \varphi) = -2\pi_7(dX)$, and from Definition 2.9 this is just $\operatorname{curl} X$ as an element of Ω^2_7, which we assume to be zero. Thus we have indeed that $\pi_7(d^*\zeta) = 0$. □

The final result in this section applies to a special case of the gauge-fixing condition when $\zeta = d\beta$ is exact. This will be needed in Theorem 5.12 to establish the infinitesimal version of the slice theorem for the AC case.

Lemma 2.19. *Let $\beta \in \Omega^2$ with $\beta = \pi_7\beta + \pi_{14}\beta$ the decomposition into types, where $\pi_7\beta = *(Y \wedge \psi) = Y \lrcorner \varphi$ for some vector field Y. Suppose that $d^*\beta = 0$ and $\pi_7(d^*d\beta) = 0$. Then $\Delta Y = 0$.*

Proof. Since $d^*\beta = 0$, we have

$$0 = \pi_7(d^*d\beta) = \pi_7(dd^*\beta + d^*d\beta) = \pi_7(\Delta\beta) = \Delta\pi_7\beta, \tag{29}$$

where we have used the fact that the Hodge Laplacian Δ commutes with the projection π_7 when the G_2 structure is torsion-free, as explained in Remark 2.4. But using (9) we see that

$$\Delta\pi_7\beta = \Delta * (Y \wedge \psi) = *\Delta(Y \wedge \psi) = *((\Delta Y) \wedge \psi).$$

Since the Hodge star operator is always an isomorphism, and wedge product with ψ on 1-forms is injective, we conclude that $\Delta Y = 0$. □

Remark 2.20. The gauge-fixing condition of Definition 2.16 is used by Joyce [11] to study the moduli space of *compact* G_2 manifolds. We use the same gauge-fixing condition for the moduli space of G_2 conifolds, but the arguments in the proofs of several results need to be modified. In particular, in the AC case when the rate of convergence to the cone at infinity is not too negative, we have $\zeta = d\sigma$ is exact, as in the compact case, but other complications arising from noncompactness require us to work a little harder to obtain some results that are analogous to the compact case, specifically Theorem 5.12 and Theorem 5.14. Moreover, in the AC case when the rate is sufficiently negative, or for any positive rate in the CS case, we do *not* have that ζ is exact. Indeed, this failure is related to the *obstructions* to the deformation theory. Our Lemmas 2.17 and 2.18 are therefore by necessity more general than the analogous results of Joyce [11].

Remark 2.21. A slightly different gauge-fixing condition for AC G_2 manifolds is discussed in [18, Definition 3.3]. The relation between these two conditions is explained in Section 6.5.

3 G_2 conifolds

In this section we reproduce material from [18] on G_2 cones, and asymptotically conical (AC) and conically singular (CS) G_2 manifolds that will be needed in the present paper. Any results stated in this section without proof can be found in [18, Section 2]. Proofs are given for any results in this section that are not from [18].

3.1 G_2 cones

Let Σ^6 be a compact, connected, smooth 6-manifold. An SU(3) structure on Σ is described by a Riemannian metric g_Σ, an almost complex structure J which is orthogonal with respect to g_Σ, the associated 2-form $\omega(u,v) = g_\Sigma(Ju, v)$ which is real and of type $(1,1)$ with respect to J, and a nonvanishing complex $(3,0)$-form Ω. The two forms are related by the normalization condition

$$\mathsf{vol}_\Sigma = \frac{1}{6}\omega^3 = \frac{i}{8}\Omega \wedge \bar{\Omega} = \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{Re}(\Omega) \wedge \mathrm{Im}(\Omega).$$

A manifold Σ^6 with SU(3) structure is called *nearly Kähler* if the following equations are satisfied:

$$d\omega = -3\,\mathrm{Re}(\Omega), \qquad d\mathrm{Im}(\Omega) = 2\,\omega^2. \tag{30}$$

Definition 3.1. Let Σ^6 be nearly Kähler. Then there exists a torsion-free G_2 structure (φ_C, ψ_C, g_C) on $C = (0,\infty) \times \Sigma$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_C &= r^3\mathrm{Re}(\Omega) - r^2 dr \wedge \omega, \\ \psi_C &= -r^3 dr \wedge \mathrm{Im}(\Omega) - r^4\frac{\omega^2}{2}, \\ g_C &= dr^2 + r^2 g_\Sigma, \end{aligned}$$

where r is the coordinate on $(0,\infty)$. The space C is a G_2 *cone*, and Σ is called the *link* of the cone. We choose the orientation on C so that $\mathsf{vol}_C = r^6 dr \wedge \mathsf{vol}_\Sigma$ is the volume form on C.

It is known for a Riemannian cone C with holonomy contained in G_2, that the holonomy is either trivial, in which case Σ is the standard round sphere S^6 and C is the Euclidean $\mathbb{R}^7$, or else the holonomy is exactly equal to G_2, in which case the link Σ is nearly Kähler, but not equal to S^6. (See Bär [3] for more details.) We reiterate that for us, a G_2 cone will always have holonomy exactly G_2, thus we will exclude the case where the link is S^6.

There are three known compact nearly Kähler manifolds (other than the round S^6), and thus three known G_2 cones. These are discussed in detail in Bär [3], but we summarize them here. They are all obtained by taking the bi-invariant metric on a compact Lie group G and descending this to the normal metric on G/H for an appropriate Lie subgroup H. In particular, all these examples are homogeneous spaces, and there is a proof by Butruille [7] that these examples are the only *homogeneous* nearly Kähler compact 6-manifolds. In [43, 44] Podestà–Spiro show that there are no nonhomogeneous compact examples of cohomogeneity one. The three known examples (as smooth manifolds) are: $\mathbb{CP}^3 \cong \mathrm{Sp}(2)/(\mathrm{Sp}(1) \times \mathrm{U}(1))$, the flag manifold $F_{1,2} \cong \mathrm{SU}(3)/T^2$, and $S^3 \times S^3 \cong (S^3 \times S^3 \times S^3)/S^3$ where we embed S^3 into $S^3 \times S^3 \times S^3$ as the diagonal subgroup. We note for later use some of the Betti numbers for these examples:

$$\begin{aligned} b^2(\mathbb{CP}^3) &= 1, & b^3(\mathbb{CP}^3) &= 0, \\ b^2(F_{1,2}) &= 2, & b^3(F_{1,2}) &= 0, \\ b^2(S^3 \times S^3) &= 0, & b^3(S^3 \times S^3) &= 2. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

For any $t > 0$, we have a *dilation* map $\mathbf{t} : C \to C$ defined by

$$\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}, \qquad \mathbf{t}(r, \sigma) = (tr, \sigma).$$

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{t}^*(\varphi_C) &= t^3\, \varphi_C, & \mathbf{t}^*(\psi_C) &= t^4\, \psi_C, \\ \mathbf{t}^*(g_C) &= t^2\, g_C, & \mathbf{t}^*(\mathsf{vol}_C) &= t^7\, \mathsf{vol}_C, \end{aligned}$$

and hence we say that the conical G_2 structure is *dilation-equivariant.* Since $g_{C_i}(r, \sigma) = t^{-2} g_{C_i}(tr, \sigma)$, we have

$$|\mathbf{t}^*(\gamma)(r, \sigma)|_{g_{C_i}(r,\sigma)} \;=\; t^k |\gamma(tr, \sigma)|_{g_{C_i}(tr,\sigma)}$$

whenever γ is a contravariant tensor of degree k.

Let α be a $(k-1)$-form on Σ and β be a k-form on Σ. Then we have

$$|r^{k-1} dr \wedge \alpha + r^k \beta|^2_{g_C} \;=\; |\alpha|^2_{g_\Sigma} + |\beta|^2_{g_\Sigma}.$$

For this reason, we will always write a k-form on C as $\gamma = r^{k-1} dr \wedge \alpha + r^k \beta$ for some α and β, which are forms on Σ possibly depending on the parameter r. Note that if α and β were independent of r, then γ would be dilation-equivariant, as defined above.

Definition 3.2. We say that a smooth k-form γ on C is *homogeneous of order* λ if

$$\gamma = r^\lambda \left(r^{k-1} dr \wedge \alpha + r^k \beta \right)$$

where α and β are forms on Σ, independent of r. Then we see that

$$|\mathbf{t}^*(\gamma)(r, \sigma)|_{g_C(tr,\sigma)} = |t^{\lambda+k} \gamma(r, \sigma)|_{g_C(tr,\sigma)} = t^{\lambda+k} t^{-k} |\gamma(r, \sigma)|_{g_C(r,\sigma)},$$

which we can write more concisely as

$$\mathbf{t}^* |\gamma|_{g_C} = t^\lambda |\gamma|_{g_C},$$

so the function $|\gamma|_{g_C}$ on C is homogeneous of order λ in the variable r in the usual sense.

Let $*_\Sigma$, ∇_Σ, d_Σ, d^*_Σ, and Δ_Σ denote the Hodge star, Levi-Civita connection, exterior derivative, coderivative, and Hodge Laplacian on Σ, respectively. Similarly $*_C$, ∇_C, d_C, d^*_C, and Δ_C will denote the corresponding operators on the cone C.

For a homogenous k-form $\gamma = r^\lambda \left(r^{k-1} dr \wedge \alpha + r^k \beta \right)$ of order λ, it is trivial to calculate that:

$$\begin{aligned} d_C \gamma &= r^{\lambda+k-1} dr \wedge ((\lambda + k)\beta - d_\Sigma \alpha) + r^{\lambda+k} d_\Sigma \beta, \\ d^*_C \gamma &= r^{\lambda+k-3} dr \wedge (-d^*_\Sigma \alpha) + r^{\lambda+k-2} (-(\lambda - k + 7)\alpha + d^*_\Sigma \beta), \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_C \gamma \;=\; & r^{\lambda+k-3} dr \wedge (\Delta_\Sigma \alpha - (\lambda + k - 2)(\lambda - k + 7)\alpha - 2 d^*_\Sigma \beta) \\ & + r^{\lambda+k-2} \left(\Delta_\Sigma \beta - (\lambda + k)(\lambda - k + 5)\beta - 2 d_\Sigma \alpha \right). \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

The next lemma is a special case of [18, Lemma 2.12].

Lemma 3.3. *Let γ be a smooth* closed 3*-form on C. Suppose that either*

$$\begin{aligned} &i)\quad |\gamma|_{g_C} = O(r^{\lambda}) \ \text{on } (0,\varepsilon)\times\Sigma,\ \text{for } \lambda > -3 \ \text{or} \\ &ii)\quad |\gamma|_{g_C} = O(r^{\lambda}) \ \text{on } (R,\infty)\times\Sigma,\ \text{for } \lambda < -3. \end{aligned}$$

for some small ε or some large R. Then for each case respectively we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &i)\quad \gamma = d\zeta \ \text{for some 2-form } \zeta \ \text{on } (0,\varepsilon)\times\Sigma,\ \text{or} \\ &ii)\quad \gamma = d\zeta \ \text{for some 2-form } \zeta \ \text{on } (R,\infty)\times\Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

We will need to consider the possible order λ of a homogeneous k-form γ_k on a cone C which is in the kernel of Δ_C, or of a mixed degree form $\gamma = \sum_{k=0}^{7}\gamma_k$ which is in the kernel of $d_C + d_C^*$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let γ be a homogeneous k-form of order λ which is harmonic on the cone: $\Delta_C\gamma = 0$. Then we have:*

$$\text{For } k = 0,7, \qquad \gamma = 0 \text{ if } \lambda \in (-5,0), \tag{34}$$
$$\text{For } k = 1,6, \qquad \gamma = 0 \text{ if } \lambda \in (-4,-1), \tag{35}$$
$$\text{For } k = 2,5, \qquad \gamma = 0 \text{ if } \lambda \in (-3,-2). \tag{36}$$

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose that γ is a homogeneous k-form of order λ which is closed and coclosed: $d_C\gamma = 0$ and $d_C^*\gamma = 0$. Then we have:*

$$\text{For } k = 0,7, \qquad \gamma = 0 \text{ if } \lambda \in (-7,0), \tag{37}$$
$$\text{For } k = 1,6, \qquad \gamma = 0 \text{ if } \lambda \in (-6,-1), \tag{38}$$
$$\text{For } k = 2,5, \qquad \gamma = 0 \text{ if } \lambda \in (-5,-2), \tag{39}$$
$$\text{For } k = 3,4, \qquad \gamma = 0 \text{ if } \lambda \in (-4,-3). \tag{40}$$

Propositions 3.4 and 3.5 use only the fact that we have a 7-dimensional Riemannian cone. However, the fact that the link Σ^6 is a compact Einstein manifold of positive scalar curvature allows us to slightly extend the results of these propositions, for functions and 1-forms. This is the content of the next result and the remark that follows. These extended ranges of excluded rates for harmonic functions and 1-forms are used, for example, in Theorem 5.12 to establish that theorem in the AC case all the way to $\nu \leq -1$, rather than just $\nu < -2$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let f be a harmonic function on a G_2 cone, homogeneous of order λ. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} f &= 0, \qquad \text{if } \lambda \in [-6,1]\setminus\{-5,0\}, \\ &= \text{constant}, \qquad \text{if } \lambda = 0 \text{ or } \lambda = -5. \end{aligned}$$

Let ω be a harmonic 1*-form on a G_2 cone, homogeneous of order λ. Then*

$$\omega = 0, \qquad \text{if } \lambda \in [-5,0].$$

Proof. A theorem of Obata [38] states that on a compact Einstein 6-manifold Σ with positive scalar curvature R, the first nonzero eigenvalue of the Laplacian on functions is not less than $\frac{R}{5}$, with equality if and only if Σ is isometric to the round S^6. The Einstein metric on the link Σ of our G_2 cones has been scaled so that $R = 30$ (see [32, 33]) and we always exclude the case of $\Sigma = S^6$, so if $\Delta_\Sigma h = \mu h$ for $h \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$, then we must have $\mu > 6$. We will use this result repeatedly in what follows.

As in Definition 3.2, we can write $f = r^\lambda \beta$ for some function β on Σ, independent of r. From (33) we have $\Delta_C f = 0$ if and only if $\Delta_\Sigma \beta = \lambda(\lambda+5)\beta$. Applying the result of Obata we can say that if f is nonzero and $\mu = \lambda(\lambda+5) \neq 0$, then $\mu > 6$. Thus if $\lambda \neq -5, 0$, then for f to be nonzero we must have $\lambda(\lambda+5) > 6$ which easily implies that $\lambda > 1$ or $\lambda < -6$. This proves the result for functions.

Now consider a 1-form $\omega = r^\lambda(dr \wedge \alpha + r\beta)$, where α is a function on Σ and β is a 1-form on Σ. From (33) we find that $\Delta_C \omega = 0$ if and only if

$$\Delta_\Sigma \alpha \;=\; (\lambda-1)(\lambda+6)\alpha + 2d^*_\Sigma \beta, \tag{41}$$

$$\Delta_\Sigma \beta \;=\; (\lambda+1)(\lambda+4)\beta + 2d_\Sigma \alpha. \tag{42}$$

Using (41) and (42), an easy computation yields

$$\Delta_\Sigma(d^*_\Sigma\beta + (\lambda-1)\alpha) \;=\; (\lambda+1)(\lambda+6)(d^*_\Sigma\beta + (\lambda-1)\alpha).$$

Thus, for the function $h = d^*_\Sigma\beta + (\lambda-1)\alpha$, we have $\Delta_\Sigma h = (\lambda+1)(\lambda+6)h$. So if $\lambda \neq -6, -1$, then the Obata result says that $h = 0$ if $(\lambda+1)(\lambda+6) \leq 6$, which corresponds to $\lambda \in [-7, 0] \setminus \{-6, -1\}$.

Suppose then, that $\lambda \in [-7,0] \setminus \{-6,-1\}$. We have $d^*_\Sigma \beta = -(\lambda-1)\alpha$, and equation (41) becomes

$$\Delta_\Sigma \alpha \;=\; (\lambda-1)(\lambda+4)\alpha.$$

Hence once again, we can say that α is zero if $\lambda \neq -4, 1$ and $(\lambda-1)(\lambda+4) \leq 6$, which corresponds to $\lambda \in [-5, 2] \setminus \{-4, 1\}$. But since our initial assumption was $\lambda \in [-7, 0] \setminus \{-6, -1\}$, we conclude that $\alpha = 0$ if $\lambda \in [-5, 0] \setminus \{-4, -1\}$, and that α is a constant if $\lambda = -4$.

Therefore, if $\lambda \in [-5, 0] \setminus \{-1\}$, then equation (42) becomes

$$\Delta_\Sigma \beta \;=\; (\lambda+1)(\lambda+4)\beta.$$

If $\lambda \in (-4, -1)$, then $\beta = 0$ because the eigenvalues of Δ_Σ are nonnegative. If $\lambda = -4$, then β is a harmonic 1-form on Σ. But by Myers' Theorem, a compact Einstein manifold with positive scalar curvature has $b^1 = 0$, so again $\beta = 0$. Finally, if $\lambda \in [-5, -4) \cup (-1, 0]$, then $0 < (\lambda+1)(\lambda+4) \leq 4$. The Böchner formula gives

$$\langle \Delta_\Sigma \beta, \beta \rangle \;=\; \langle \nabla^*_\Sigma \nabla_\Sigma \beta, \beta \rangle + \mathrm{Ric}_\Sigma(\beta, \beta) \;=\; \langle \nabla^*_\Sigma \nabla_\Sigma \beta, \beta \rangle + 5|\beta|^2,$$

since $\mathrm{Ric}_\Sigma = \frac{R}{6} g_\Sigma = 5 g_\Sigma$. Integrating the above equation over Σ, we find that if $\Delta_\Sigma \beta = \mu\beta$, then we must have $\mu \geq 5$ for nonzero β. Thus in all cases of $\lambda \in [-5, 0] \setminus \{-1\}$, we have $\beta = 0$. We have already shown that for these rates, $\alpha = 0$ except when $\lambda = -4$, in which case $\alpha = c$ is a constant. But substituting this information back into equation (41) gives $c = 0$ in this case as well. Thus we have shown that $\omega = 0$ for $\lambda \in [-5, 0] \setminus \{-1\}$.

All that remains is to consider the case $\lambda = -1$. In this case (42) says that $\Delta_\Sigma \beta = 2 d_\Sigma \alpha$ is exact, so by the Hodge theorem, $\beta = \beta_{\mathcal{H}} + G_\Sigma \Delta_\Sigma(\beta) = \beta_{\mathcal{H}} + d_\Sigma(2 G_\Sigma \alpha)$ is closed, where $\beta_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the harmonic part of β and G_Σ is the Green's operator for Δ_Σ. Using the fact that $d_\Sigma \beta = 0$ in this case, taking d_Σ of equation (41), using equation (42), and substituting $\lambda = -1$, gives

$$\Delta_\Sigma d_\Sigma \alpha \;=\; -10 d_\Sigma \alpha + 2\Delta_\Sigma \beta \;=\; -10 d_\Sigma \alpha + 2 d_\Sigma \alpha \;=\; -8 d_\Sigma \alpha.$$

Hence we have $d_\Sigma \alpha = 0$. Now equation (42) says that β is harmonic, hence $\beta = 0$ again by Myers' Theorem. Now (41) says $\Delta_\Sigma \alpha = -10\alpha$, so $\alpha = 0$ as well. $\square$

Remark 3.7. Let ω be a homogeneous 1-form of order λ on a G_2 cone which is closed and coclosed. Then $\omega = 0$ if $\lambda \in (-6, 0]$. This follows immediately from Propositions 3.5 and 3.6 since closed and coclosed forms are harmonic.

The next lemma is similar to [18, Proposition 2.22]. It is more general in that it is valid for any rate λ, but less general in that it is stated only for forms of pure degree. The method of proof, however, is different and follows the discussion immediately preceding [26, Proposition 5.6]. This result is needed to compute the dimension of the moduli space in Section 5.2.5 because the dimension is computed using Theorem 4.21, and the spaces $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)$ a priori could involve log terms.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $m \geq 0$, and let $\gamma = \sum_{l=0}^{m} (\log r)^l \gamma_l$ be a k-form in the kernel of $d + d_C^*$, where each γ_l is homogeneous of order λ, and $\gamma_m \neq 0$. Then necessarily $m = 0$. That is, $\gamma = \gamma_0$ has no* log *terms.*

Proof. Each γ_l is homogeneous of order λ, so it can be written as

$$\gamma_l \;=\; r^{k-1+\lambda} dr \wedge \alpha_l + r^{k+\lambda} \beta_l \tag{43}$$

where α_l and β_l are $(k-1)$-forms and k-forms on Σ, respectively, independent of r. For any k-form γ_l on C, it is easy to check that

$$(d + d_C^*)((\log r)^l \gamma_l) = (\log r)^l (d_C + d_C^*)(\gamma_l) + \frac{l}{r} (\log r)^{l-1} (dr \wedge \gamma_l) - \frac{l}{r} (\log r)^{l-1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \lrcorner \gamma_l \right).$$

Using this identity, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}(d + d_C^*) \left(\sum_{l=0}^{m} (\log r)^l \gamma_l \right) &= (\log r)^m (d_C + d_C^*) (\gamma_m) \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} (\log r)^l \left((d + d_C^*)(\gamma_l) + \frac{(l+1)}{r} dr \wedge \gamma_{l+1} - \frac{(l+1)}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \lrcorner \gamma_{l+1} \right).\end{aligned}$$

The above expression must vanish as a polynomial in $\log r$. Setting the coefficient of $(\log r)^m$ equal to zero, and decomposing into forms of pure degree, we obtain $d\gamma_m = 0$ and $d_C^* \gamma_m = 0$, which from (43) can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} d\alpha_m &= (\lambda + k)\beta_m, \qquad & d_C^* \alpha_m &= 0, \\ d\beta_m &= 0, & d_C^* \beta_m &= (\lambda + 7 - k)\alpha_m. \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Similarly the coefficient of $(\log r)^{m-1}$ gives $d\gamma_{m-1} + \frac{m}{r} dr \wedge \gamma_m = 0$ and $d_C^* \gamma_{m-1} - \frac{m}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \lrcorner \gamma_m = 0$, which simplify to

$$\begin{aligned} d\alpha_{m-1} &= (\lambda + k)\beta_{m-1} + m\beta_m, \qquad & d_C^* \alpha_{m-1} &= 0, \\ d\beta_{m-1} &= 0, & d_C^* \beta_{m-1} &= (\lambda + 7 - k)\alpha_{m-1} + m\alpha_m. \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Using the systems of equations (44) and (45) on Σ and taking L^2 inner products, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
m||\alpha_m||^2 + m||\beta_m||^2 &= \langle\langle m\alpha_m, \alpha_m\rangle\rangle + \langle\langle m\beta_m, \beta_m\rangle\rangle \\
&= \langle\langle d^*_{C}\beta_{m-1} - (\lambda + 7 - k)\alpha_{m-1}, \alpha_m\rangle\rangle \\
&\qquad + \langle\langle d\alpha_{m-1} - (\lambda + k)\beta_{m-1}, \beta_m\rangle\rangle \\
&= \langle\langle \beta_{m-1}, d\alpha_m\rangle\rangle - (\lambda + 7 - k)\langle\langle \alpha_{m-1}, \alpha_m\rangle\rangle \\
&\qquad + \langle\langle \alpha_{m-1}, d^*_{C}\beta_m\rangle\rangle - (\lambda + k)\langle\langle \beta_{m-1}, \beta_m\rangle\rangle \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\gamma_m \neq 0$, we conclude that $m = 0$. ☐

Remark 3.9. A generalization of Lemma 3.8 to mixed degree forms is possible, using the same techniques, and in any dimension. We do not state it because we will not have occasion to use it. This means in particular, that in the published version of [18], the last sentence in the proof of [18, Proposition 2.23] is incorrect. That is, there are never any "log terms" for the operator $d + d^*_{C}$.

The next proposition is useful for analyzing the *critical rates* of the operator $d+d^*_{C}$ in Section 4.2.

Proposition 3.10. *Let $\gamma = \sum_{k=0}^{7} \gamma_k$ be a mixed degree form on the cone, homogeneous of order λ, and suppose that $(d + d^*_{C})(\gamma) = 0$.*

- *If $\lambda = -3$, then $\gamma = \beta + dr \wedge \alpha$, where β and α are* both *harmonic 3-forms on Σ.*
- *If $\lambda = -4$, then $\gamma = r^{-2} dr \wedge \alpha + \beta$, where α is a harmonic 2-form and β is a harmonic 4-form on Σ.*

Proof. The even-degree case of the first statement is exactly Proposition 2.21 in [18]. The odd-degree case, and the second statement, are proved in exactly the same way. ☐

Remark 3.11. Proposition 3.10 is used in Section 4.3 to explicitly describe the change in the space of closed and coclosed forms on a G_2 conifold at rates -3 and -4.

Finally, we need to consider the excluded range of orders of homogeneity for elements in the kernel of the modified Dirac operator $\breve{D\!\!\!/}_{C}$ defined in equation (21). This result does not appear in [18], so we include the proof.

Proposition 3.12. *Let $\breve{D\!\!\!/}_{C} : \Omega^0_1 \oplus \Omega^1_7 \to \Omega^3_1 \oplus \Omega^3_7$ be the modified Dirac operator on a G_2 cone. Let $s = (f, X)$ in the domain of $\breve{D\!\!\!/}_{C}$ be homogeneous of order λ such that $\breve{D\!\!\!/}_{C}(s) = 0$. Then we have:*

$$s = 0 \text{ if } \lambda \in (-4, -1). \tag{46}$$

Proof. Suppose that $\breve{D\!\!\!/}_{C}(s) = 0 \in \Omega^3_1 \oplus \Omega^3_7$. Corollary 2.14 tells us that $\Delta_{C} f = 0$ and $\Delta_{C} X = 0$. The statement now follows immediately from Proposition 3.4. ☐

Remark 3.13. We can possibly obtain a larger excluded range of orders of homogeneity for elements of the kernel of the modified Dirac operator, by exploiting the second half of equation (23), namely that $df = \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{curl} X$. However, for our purposes the result of Proposition 3.12 will be good enough.

3.2 Asymptotically conical (AC) G_2 manifolds

Let M be a noncompact, connected smooth 7-dimensional manifold.

Definition 3.14. The manifold M is called an *asymptotically conical* G_2 manifold with cone C and *rate* $\nu < 0$ if all of the following holds:

- The manifold M is a G_2 manifold with torsion-free G_2 structure $\varphi_{_M}$ and metric $g_{_M}$.
- There is a G_2 cone $(C, \varphi_{_C}, g_{_C})$ with *connected* link Σ.
- There is a compact subset $L \subset M$, an $R > 1$, and a map $h : (R, \infty) \times \Sigma \to M$ that is a *diffeomorphism* of $(R, \infty) \times \Sigma$ onto $M \backslash L$.
- The pullback $h^*(\varphi_{_M})$ is a torsion-free G_2 structure on the subset $(R, \infty) \times \Sigma$ of C. We require that this approach the torsion-free G_2 structure $\varphi_{_C}$ in a C^∞ sense, with rate $\nu < 0$. This means that
$$|\nabla^j_{_C}(h^*(\varphi_{_M}) - \varphi_{_C})|_{g_C} = O(r^{\nu - j}) \qquad \forall j \geq 0 \tag{47}$$
in $(R, \infty) \times \Sigma$. Note that all norms and derivatives are computed using the cone metric $g_{_C}$.

It is clear that an AC G_2 manifold of rate ν_0 is also an AC G_2 manifold for all $\nu > \nu_0$.

Remark 3.15. The link Σ of an AC G_2 manifold M must be connected because M can have only one end. This follows from the Cheeger–Gromoll splitting theorem, which says that a complete noncompact Ricci-flat manifold with more than one end isometrically splits into a Riemannian product, and thus the holonomy would be reducible.

Example 3.16. There are three known examples of asymptotically conical G_2 manifolds, whose asymptotic cones have links given by the three known nearly Kähler manifolds. They are all total spaces of vector bundles over a compact base. These manifolds were discovered by Bryant–Salamon [6] and were the first examples of complete G_2 manifolds. Specifically, they are:

- $\Lambda^2_-(S^4)$, the bundle of anti-self-dual 2-forms over the 4-sphere. This is a non-trivial rank 3 vector bundle over the standard round S^4. This AC G_2 manifold is asymptotic to the cone over the nearly Kähler $\mathbb{CP}^3$, with rate $\nu = -4$.

- $\Lambda^2_-(\mathbb{CP}^2)$, the bundle of anti-self dual 2-forms over the complex projective plane. This is a non-trivial rank 3 vector bundle over the standard Fubini-Study $\mathbb{CP}^2$. This AC G_2 manifold is asymptotic to the cone over the nearly Kähler flag manifold $F_{1,2}$, also with rate $\nu = -4$.

- $\not{S}(S^3)$, the spinor bundle of the 3-sphere. This is a trivial rank 4 vector bundle over the standard round S^3, hence is topologically $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}^4$. This AC G_2 manifold is asymptotic to the cone over the nearly Kähler $S^3 \times S^3$, with rate $\nu = -3$.

Remark 3.17. Explicit formulas for these asymptotically conical G_2 structures, as well as the fact that their rates are -4, -4, and -3, respectively, can be found in Bryant–Salamon [6], and also in Atiyah–Witten [2]. We will not have need for these explicit formulas.

3.3 Conically singular (CS) G_2 manifolds

Let $\overline{M}$ be a compact, connected topological space, and let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be a finite set of isolated points in $\overline{M}$. Assume that $M = \overline{M} \backslash \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ is a smooth noncompact 7-dimensional manifold that we will call the *smooth part* of $\overline{M}$ and $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ will be called the *singular points* of $\overline{M}$.

Definition 3.18. The space $\overline{M}$ is called a G_2 *manifold with isolated conical singularities*, with cones $C_1, \ldots, C_n$ at $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and *rates* $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n$, where each $\nu_i > 0$, if all of the following holds:

- The smooth part M is a G_2 manifold with torsion-free G_2 structure $\varphi_{_M}$ and metric $g_{_M}$.
- There are G_2 cones $(C_i, \varphi_{C_i}, g_{C_i})$ with links Σ_i for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.
- There is a compact subset $K \subset M$ such that $M \backslash K$ is a union of open sets $S_1, \ldots, S_n$ whose closures $\overline{S}_1, \ldots, \overline{S}_n$ in $\overline{M}$ are all *disjoint* in $\overline{M}$. There is an $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, and for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, there is a map $h_i : (0, \varepsilon) \times \Sigma_i \to M$ that is a *diffeomorphism* of $(0, \varepsilon) \times \Sigma_i$ onto S_i.
- The pullback $h_i^*(\varphi_{_M})$ is a torsion-free G_2 structure on the subset $(0, \varepsilon) \times \Sigma_i$ of C_i. We require that this approach the torsion-free G_2 structure φ_{C_i} in a C^∞ sense, with rate $\nu_i > 0$. This means that
$$|\nabla^j_{C_i}(h_i^*(\varphi_{_M}) - \varphi_{C_i})|_{g_{C_i}} = O(r^{\nu_i - j}) \qquad \forall j \geq 0 \tag{48}$$
in $(0, \varepsilon) \times \Sigma_i$. Note that all norms and derivatives are computed using the cone metric g_{C_i}.

It is clear that a CS G_2 manifold of rate ν_0 is also a CS G_2 manifold for all $\nu < \nu_0$. We also note that $\overline{M}$ is the closure of M in $\overline{M}$. We will often abbreviate the phrase "compact G_2 manifold with isolated conical singularities" as conically singular or CS G_2 manifold.

There are at present still no examples of conically singular G_2 manifolds, although they are expected to exist in abundance. The main theorem in [18] can be interpreted as evidence for the likelihood of their existence, in the sense that they should arise as 'boundary points' in the moduli space of smooth compact G_2 manifolds. The first author, in collaboration with Dominic Joyce, has a new construction of compact G_2 manifolds [14] that may be generalizable to produce the first examples of compact G_2 manifolds with isolated conical singularities.

4 Lockhart–McOwen analysis for G_2 conifolds

In this section we summarize the essential aspects of the Lockhart–McOwen theory for AC and CS manifolds that we will require. This theory originally appeared in Lockhart–McOwen [22] and Lockhart [23]. A very detailed exposition can also be found in Marshall [29].

The essential idea is as follows. By introducing appropriately *weighted* Banach spaces of sections of vector bundles over an AC manifold or over the smooth, noncompact part of a CS manifold, one generically obtains a nice Fredholm theory for an elliptic operator $P : V \to W$ such as the Laplacian or the Dirac operator. Basically, as long as we stay away from certain "critical rates", which form a discrete set, these operators will be Fredholm and we can write $W = \mathrm{im}(P) \oplus C$ for some finite-dimensional complement C which is isomorphic to $\ker(P^*)$. The precise details are explained below.

We will mostly use this theory for weighted Sobolev spaces. However, it applies equally well to weighted Hölder spaces, and we will require the relations between these spaces (the *Sobolev embedding theorems*) in order to deal with some regularity issues, in particular to ensure that the sections are at least twice continuously differentiable.

Throughout this section, we use M to denote a G_2 *conifold*, which is either an asymptotically conical (AC) G_2 manifold, as in Definition 3.14, or the smooth part of a conically singular (CS) G_2 manifold, as in Definition 3.18. Many, but not all, of the results are valid for any *Riemannian conifold*, although the results are always stated in the particular dimension 7 for convenience.

The analytic results for AC manifolds hold equally well for CS manifolds with minor differences. The most significant difference is that all the inequalities involving rates must be reversed, since the noncompact ends correspond to $r \to 0$ instead of $r \to \infty$. Also, on a CS manifold we can have n ends as opposed to just one.

4.1 Weighted Banach spaces on conifolds

In order to define sensible "weighted" Banach spaces on M, we need the concept of a radius function.

Definition 4.1. A *radius function* ϱ is a smooth function on M satisfying the following conditions.

- **AC case:** On the compact subset L of M, we define $\varrho \equiv 1$. Let x be a point in $h((2R, \infty) \times \Sigma)$. Then $h^{-1}(x) = (r, p)$ for some $r \in (2R, \infty)$ and $p \in \Sigma$. We define $\varrho(x) = r$ for such a point. In the region $h((R, 2R) \times \Sigma)$, the function ϱ is defined by interpolating smoothly between its definition near infinity and its definition in the compact subset L, in a decreasing fashion.

- **CS case:** On the compact subset $K = M \setminus \sqcup_{i=1}^n S_i$, we define $\varrho \equiv 1$. Let x be a point in the neighbourhood $h_i((0, \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon) \times \Sigma_i)$ of the i^{th} singularity x_i. Then $h_i^{-1}(x) = (r, p)$ for some $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon)$ and $p \in \Sigma_i$. We define $\varrho(x) = r$ for such a point. In the regions $h_i((\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \times \Sigma_i)$, the function ϱ is defined by interpolating smoothly between its definitions near the singularities and its definition in the compact subset K, in an increasing fashion.

We can now define the weighted Sobolev spaces on M. Let E be a vector bundle over M with a fibrewise metric. In all instances in this paper, E will either be the bundle $\Lambda^k(T^*M)$ of k-forms on M, or the space of all forms $\Lambda^\bullet(T^*M) = \sum_{k=0}^7 \Lambda^k(T^*M)$ on M, or the spinor bundle $\displaystyle{\not}S(M)$ over M, described in Section 2.3. The fibrewise metric in all these cases is naturally induced from the Riemannian metric on M, and the Levi-Civita connection ∇_M naturally induces a connection on E which we continue to denote by ∇_M.

We want to define the *weighted Sobolev space* of sections of E with rate λ. In the AC case, we let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. In the CS case, we let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We can add such n-tuples and multiply them by real numbers using the vector space structure of $\mathbb{R}^n$. We also define $\lambda + j = (\lambda_1 + j, \ldots, \lambda_n + j)$ for any $j \in \mathbb{R}$, and we say that $\lambda > \lambda'$ if $\lambda_i > \lambda'_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Finally we define ϱ^λ to equal ϱ^{λ_i} on $h_i((0, \varepsilon) \times \Sigma_i)$ and to equal 1 on the compact subset K. Then ϱ^λ is a smooth function on M which equals r^{λ_i} on the neighbourhood $h_i((0, \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon) \times \Sigma_i)$ of the singular point x_i.

Definition 4.2. Let $l \geq 0$, $p > 1$, and let λ be as above. We define the *weighted Sobolev space* $L^p_{l,\lambda}(E)$ of sections of E over M as follows. Consider the space $C^\infty_{\text{cs}}(E)$ of smooth compactly supported sections of E. For such sections the quantity

$$||\gamma||_{L^p_{l,\lambda}} = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{l} \int_{M'} |\varrho^{-\lambda+j} \nabla^j_M \gamma|^p_{g_M} \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \tag{49}$$

is clearly finite, and is a norm. We define the Banach space $L^p_{l,\lambda}(E)$ to be the completion of $C^\infty_{\text{cs}}(E)$ with respect to this norm.

Remark 4.3. We make a few important remarks about this definition.

(a) As a topological vector space, $L^p_{l,\lambda}(E)$ is independent of the choice of radius function ϱ, and any two such choices lead to equivalent norms.

(b) We clearly have $L^p_{l,\lambda}(E) \subseteq L^p_{l,\lambda'}(E)$ if $\lambda < \lambda'$ in the AC case or if $\lambda > \lambda'$ in the CS case.

(c) An element γ in $L^p_{l,\lambda}(E)$ can be intuitively thought of as a section of E that is l times weakly differentiable such that near each end, the tensor $\nabla^j_M \gamma$ is growing at most like $r^{\lambda - j}$.

(d) The space $L^2_{l,\lambda}(E)$ is a *Hilbert space*, with inner product coming from the polarization of the norm in (49). Because of the factor ϱ^{-7} in (49), we have

$$L^2_{0,-\frac{7}{2}}(E) \;=\; L^2(E),$$

where $L^2(E)$ is the usual space of L^2 sections of E. Here and henceforth it is understood that in the CS case $\frac{7}{2}$ denotes the 'constant' n-tuple $(\frac{7}{2}, \ldots, \frac{7}{2})$.

Remark 4.4. We will almost always just take $p = 2$ in this paper. The only time we will need to consider $p \neq 2$ is in Lemma 5.18, which uses the general Sobolev embedding Theorem 4.6 below.

The following proposition about dual spaces is easy to see from Definition 4.2.

Proposition 4.5. *There is a Banach space isomorphism*

$$\left(L^2_{0,\lambda}(E)\right)^* \;\cong\; L^2_{0,-\lambda-7}(E),$$

given by the L^2 inner product pairing.

We will likewise have need of the analogous weighted *Hölder spaces*. Their definition is a bit more involved. See, for example [24, 29] for the precise definition. However, all that we will require from the weighted Hölder spaces is that elements in them have some degree of differentiability with control on their growth rate on the ends, and that these spaces are related to the weighted Sobolev spaces by the *embedding theorems*, which we will state precisely. The embedding theorems are used implicitly in Remark 4.12 below to explain why elements in the kernel of a uniformly elliptic operator are in fact C^∞.

Let $m \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Then the weighted Hölder space $C^{m,\alpha}_\lambda(E)$ is a Banach space of sections of E, whose elements have *m continuous derivatives*.

Theorem 4.6 (Weighted Sobolev embedding theorem)**.** *Let $l, m \geq 0$ and let $\alpha \in (0,1)$.*

- *If $l \geq m$, $l - \frac{7}{p} \geq m - \frac{7}{q}$, and $p \leq q$, then there is a* continuous embedding

$$L^p_{l,\lambda}(E) \hookrightarrow L^q_{m,\lambda}(E).$$

- *If $l - \frac{7}{2} \geq m + \alpha$, then there is a* continuous embedding

$$L^p_{l,\lambda}(E) \hookrightarrow C^{m,\alpha}_\lambda(E).$$

Proof. See Marshall [29, Theorem 4.17] for a proof. We have only stated some special cases, which are all that we will require. □

Corollary 4.7. *If $l \geq 6$, then any section $\gamma \in L^2_{l,\lambda}(E)$ is twice continuously differentiable.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Theorem 4.6 by taking $m = 2$. □

We will *always* assume that $l \geq 6$ without explicit mention, so that in particular any second order differential operators on such sections are unambiguously defined.

4.2 Fredholm and elliptic operators on conifolds

To make some of the equations easier to read, we will often use the following shorthand notation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega^{\bullet}_{l,\lambda} &= L^2_{l,\lambda}(\Lambda^{\bullet}(T^*M)), \\
\Omega^{k}_{l,\lambda} &= L^2_{l,\lambda}(\Lambda^{k}(T^*M)), \qquad 0 \leq k \leq 7, \\
\not{S}_{l,\lambda} &= L^2_{l,\lambda}(\not{S}(M)).
\end{aligned}$$

We will be interested in the following three differential operators:

$$(d + d^*_{M})_{l+1,\lambda} \,:\, \Omega^{\bullet}_{l+1,\lambda} \to \Omega^{\bullet}_{l,\lambda-1}, \tag{50}$$

$$(\Delta_{M})_{l+2,\lambda} \,:\, \Omega^{k}_{l+2,\lambda} \to \Omega^{k}_{l,\lambda-2}, \tag{51}$$

$$(\not{D}_{M})_{l+1,\lambda} \,:\, \not{S}_{l+1,\lambda} \to \not{S}_{l,\lambda-1}. \tag{52}$$

They are defined by extending the operators $d + d^*_{M}$, Δ_{M}, and $\not{D}_{M}$ from smooth compactly supported sections to the Sobolev spaces. Note that the Laplacian Δ_{M} preserves the degree k of forms, so strictly speaking we should include the degree k as an extra label on the left hand side of (51), but we will not do this, to avoid the proliferation of notation. We will let r denote the order of the differential operator, which is 1, 2, and 1, respectively, in these three cases. Using the symbol P to denote one of these operators, and E to denote the vector bundle on which it acts, the above three operators can all be written as

$$P_{l+r,\lambda} \,:\, L^2_{l+r,\lambda}(E) \to L^2_{l,\lambda-r}(E). \tag{53}$$

In fact, we will also be interested in the modified Dirac operator $\breve{\not{D}}_{M}$ defined in Section 2.3, as well as in the *restriction* of $d + d^*_{M}$ to the space $\Omega^3_{l+1,\lambda}$ of 3-forms, which we will denote simply by $(\mathfrak{D}_{M})_{l+1,\lambda}$. That is,

$$\mathfrak{D}_{M} = (d + d^*_{M})|_{\Omega^3}. \tag{54}$$

It is a standard fact that the operators $d + d^*_{M}$, Δ_{M}, and $\not{D}_{M}$ are *elliptic*, and in Proposition 2.13 we proved that $\breve{\not{D}}_{M}$ is also elliptic. In fact these operators are also all *uniformly elliptic* in the sense that near infinity, they approach the elliptic operators $d + d^*_{C}$, Δ_{C}, $\not{D}_{C}$, and $\breve{\not{D}}_{C}$ on the cone C, respectively. (The operator $\mathfrak{D}_{M}$, being the restriction of $d + d^*_{M}$ to the space of 3-forms, is *not* elliptic, but for suitable rates λ and suitably redefined codomain, it will be Fredholm. This is discussed in Section 5.2.4.) The following result is an *elliptic regularity* statement for uniformly elliptic operators.

Theorem 4.8. *Let P be a uniformly elliptic operator. Suppose that γ and υ are both locally integrable sections of E, and that γ is a weak solution of the equation $P(\gamma) = \upsilon$. If $\gamma \in L^2_{0,\lambda}(E)$ and $\upsilon \in L^2_{l,\lambda-r}(E)$, then $\gamma \in L^2_{l+r,\lambda}(E)$, and γ is a strong solution of $P(\gamma) = \upsilon$. Furthermore, we have*

$$||\gamma||_{L^2_{l+r,\lambda}} \leq C \left(||P(\gamma)||_{L^2_{l,\lambda-r}} + ||\gamma||_{L^2_{0,\lambda}} \right) \tag{55}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of γ. That is, γ has at least r more derivatives worth of regularity than $\upsilon = P(\gamma)$.

We will need to use some results about the kernels and indices of linear operators. To this end we must first define the *critical rates* for these operators, which depend on the geometry of the links of the cones on each end.

Definition 4.9. Let C be a G_2 cone. Let P_C be one of the operators $d + d^*_C$, Δ_C, $\not{D}_C$, $\breve{\not{D}}_C$, or $\mathfrak{D}_C$ acting on sections of some vector bundle E over C. The set $\mathcal{D}_{P_C}$ of *critical rates* of the operator P_C on sections of E is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}_{P_C} = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R};\ \exists \text{ a nonzero section } \gamma \text{ of } E, \text{ homogeneous of order } \lambda, \text{ with } P_C(\gamma) = 0\}\,. \tag{56}$$

The set $\mathcal{D}_{P_C}$ is a countable, discrete subset of $\mathbb{R}$, with no accumulation points. The definition of 'homogeneous of order λ' for a k-form on a cone was given in Definition 3.2. If γ is a mixed degree form or a spinor in $\slashed{S}(C)$ (which from Section 2.3 consists of a function and a 1-form), homogeneous means that each graded component is homogeneous.

In the AC case a rate $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is a *critical rate* of P if it is a critical rate of the corresponding operator P_C on its asymptotic cone C. In the CS case we have n ends which are modeled on cones, and a rate $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ will be a *critical rate* for P if any of its components λ_i lie in the corresponding critical set $\mathcal{D}_{P_{C_i}}$ for the cone C_i. We say that the "interval" $[\lambda, \lambda']$ does not contain any critical rates for P on M if each interval $[\lambda_i, \lambda'_i]$ contains no critical rates for P on the cone C_i.

Example 4.10. Consider the operator $d + d^*_M$ on the AC G_2 manifolds of Bryant–Salamon discussed in Example 3.16. By Proposition 3.10, we see that -3 is a critical rate for $d + d^*_M$ if and only if $b^3(\Sigma)$ is nonzero, which by (31) occurs only for $\slashed{S}(S^3)$. Similarly, -4 is a critical rate for $d + d^*_M$ if and only if $b^2(\Sigma) = b^4(\Sigma)$ is nonzero, which by (31) occurs only for $\Lambda^2_-(\mathbb{CP}^2)$ and $\Lambda^2_-(S^4)$. In all three cases the rate ν of convergence at infinity to the asymptotic cone is a critical rate for $d + d^*_M$.

Theorem 4.11. *The* kernel *of* $(P)^2_{l+r,\lambda}$ *is independent of* l*. Hence we can denote it unambigiously as* $\ker(P)_\lambda$*. This kernel is also invariant as we change the rate* λ*, as long as we do not hit any critical rates. That is, if the interval* $[\lambda, \lambda']$ *is contained in the complement of* $\mathcal{D}_P$*, then*

$$\ker(P)_{\lambda'} = \ker(P)_\lambda.$$

Remark 4.12. The Sobolev embedding Theorem 4.6 says that for large enough l, we can embed the Sobolev space $L^2_{l,\lambda}(E)$ into an appropriate *Hölder space* $C^{m,\alpha}_\lambda(E)$ having m continuous derivatives. It follows from this theorem and the elliptic regularity of Theorem 4.8 that elements in the kernel of P are smooth, and the independence of the kernels on l follows from this.

Recall that a linear map between Banach spaces is called *Fredholm* if it has closed image, finite-dimensional kernel, and finite-dimensional cokernel. The main significance of the critical rates $\mathcal{D}_P$ is that they are related to the rates λ for which the operator $P_{l+r,\lambda}$ of equation (53) is Fredholm, by the following theorem.

Theorem 4.13. *The map* $P_{l+r,\lambda} : L^2_{l+r,\lambda}(E) \to L^2_{l,\lambda-r}(E)$ *is Fredholm if and only if* $\lambda \notin \mathcal{D}_P$*, where the set of critical rates* $\mathcal{D}_P$ *is as given in Definition 4.9.*

Now consider the adjoint of the map

$$P_{l+r,\lambda} : L^2_{l+r,\lambda}(E) \to L^2_{l,\lambda-r}(E).$$

By Proposition 4.5, the adjoint is a map

$$P^*_{m+r,-7+r-\lambda} : L^2_{m+r,-7+r-\lambda}(E) \to L^2_{m,-7-\lambda}(E), \tag{57}$$

where $l, m \geq 0$.

Remark 4.14. Here we are being slightly sloppy, in the following sense. Technically, we really have $\left(L^2_{l,\lambda}\right)^* = L^2_{-l,-\lambda-7}$, but we would like to avoid having to consider the meaning of $L^2_{l,\lambda}$ for $l < 0$. Fortunately, we will only ever be interested in the *kernel* of the adjoint P^* on spaces of the form $L^2_{m+r,\lambda}$, which by Theorem 4.11 is independent of m, so it is safe to assume that $m \geq 0$.

The next result is the version of the 'Fredholm Alternative' for conifolds.

Theorem 4.15. *Suppose that λ is not in $\mathcal{D}_P$, so that by Theorem 4.13, the map*

$$P_{l+r,\lambda} \,:\, L^2_{l+r,\lambda}(E) \,\to\, L^2_{l,\lambda-r}(E)$$

is Fredholm, and also uniformly elliptic. Then:

(a) We can choose a finite-dimensional subspace $W_{\lambda-r}$ of $L^2_{l,\lambda-r}(E)$ such that

$$L^2_{l,\lambda-r}(E) \,=\, P(L^2_{l+r,\lambda}(E)) \oplus W_{\lambda-r}, \tag{58}$$

such that

$$W_{\lambda-r} \,\cong\, \ker(P^*)_{-7+r-\lambda}. \tag{59}$$

(b) Furthermore, if $\ker(P^*)_{-7+r-\lambda}$ actually lies in $L^2_{l,\lambda-r}(E)$, then we can actually take

$$W_{\lambda-r} \,=\, \ker(P^*)_{-7+r-\lambda}.$$

By Remark 4.3 (b), this happens whenever $-7+r-\lambda < \lambda - r$ in the AC case, or equivalently whenever $\lambda > -\frac{7}{2} + r$, and whenever $\lambda < -\frac{7}{2} + r$ in the CS case.

Remark 4.16. Equation (59) is a consequence of general Banach space theory and Proposition 4.5, since whenever a subspace W of a Banach space V is closed, any direct complement of it will be isomorphic to its annihilator in the dual space.

Remark 4.17. Because of Remark 4.3 (b) and equation (59) we see that $\ker(P)_\lambda$ and $\operatorname{coker}(P)_\lambda$ are always finite-dimensional, even if λ is a critical rate. Thus it is only the failure of $\operatorname{im}(P)$ to be closed that occurs at a critical rate.

As we will be using both the Fredholm theory of $\Delta_{_M}$ and that of $d + d^*_{_M}$, we will need to know how elements in the kernels of these two operators are related. In particular, a k-form which is closed and coclosed is always harmonic, but the converse will only be true for certain rates. Also, when a mixed degree form $\gamma = \sum_{k=0}^{7} \gamma_k$ is closed and coclosed, it will not always be the case that each graded component γ_k is independently closed and coclosed.

Proposition 4.18. *Let $\gamma = \sum_{k=0}^{7} \gamma_k \in \Omega^\bullet_{l+1,\lambda}$, where each $\gamma_k \in \Omega^k_{l+1,\lambda}$, and suppose $(d+d^*_{_M})(\gamma) = 0$. If $\lambda < -\frac{5}{2}$ (AC) or $\lambda > -\frac{5}{2}$ (CS), then in fact $(d + d^*_{_M})(\gamma_k) = 0$ for each k.*

Proof. Decomposing the equation $(d + d^*_{_M})(\gamma) = 0$ into graded components, we have

$$d\gamma_{k-1} \,=\, -d^*_{_M}\gamma_{k+1},$$

where $\gamma_{-1} = \gamma_8 = 0$. Both sides of the above equation are in $\Omega^k_{l,\lambda-1}$. The hypothesis on λ and parts (b) and (d) of Remark 4.3 imply that $d\gamma_k$ and $d^*_{_M}\gamma_k$ are in $\Omega^\bullet_{l+1,-\frac{7}{2}} \subseteq L^2(\Lambda^\bullet(T^*M))$ for all k. Therefore the following computation is valid:

$$||d\gamma_k||^2 = \langle\langle d\gamma_k, d\gamma_k\rangle\rangle = -\langle\langle d\gamma_k, d^*_{_M}\gamma_{k+2}\rangle\rangle = -\langle\langle \gamma_k, d^*_{_M} d^*_{_M}\gamma_{k+2}\rangle\rangle = 0,$$

and hence $d\gamma_k = d^*_{_M}\gamma_k = 0$ for all k. $\square$

Corollary 4.19. *Suppose that* $\gamma \in \Omega^k_{l+2,\lambda}$ *and that* $\Delta_M \gamma = 0$*. Then we have:*

$$\text{For } k = 0,7, \text{ if } \lambda < 0 \text{ (AC) or if every } \lambda_i > -5 \text{ (CS), then } d^*_M\gamma = 0 \text{ and } d\gamma = 0. \tag{60}$$

$$\text{For } k = 1,6, \text{ if } \lambda < -1 \text{ (AC) or if every } \lambda_i > -4 \text{ (CS), then } d^*_M\gamma = 0 \text{ and } d\gamma = 0. \tag{61}$$

$$\text{For } k = 2,5, \text{ if } \lambda < -2 \text{ (AC) or if every } \lambda_i > -3 \text{ (CS), then } d^*_M\gamma = 0 \text{ and } d\gamma = 0. \tag{62}$$

Proof. In the AC setting, by Proposition 3.4 we see that in all three cases, as we decrease λ there are no critical rates until at the earliest $\lambda = -3$. So by Theorem 4.11, in all three cases we can say that γ actually lies in $\ker(\Delta_M)_{-\frac{5}{2}-e}$ for some small $e > 0$. The claims now all follow from integration by parts as in the proof of Proposition 4.18.

In the CS setting, by Proposition 3.4 we see that in all three cases, as we increase each λ_i there are no critical rates until at the earliest $\lambda_i = -2$. Therefore by Theorem 4.11, in all three cases we can say that ω_k actually lies in $\ker(\Delta_M)_{-\frac{5}{2}+e}$ for some small $e > 0$. The claims now all follow as in the AC case. ☐

Recall that the *index* of a Fredholm operator P is given by $\operatorname{ind}(P) = \dim(\ker P) - \dim(\ker P^*)$. In order to compute the dimension of the moduli space, we will need to understand how the index of P changes as we cross a critical rate. To this end we require the following definition. Let P_C denote the operator on the cone corresponding to P.

Definition 4.20. Let C be a G_2 cone. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the space $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{P_C}$ to be

$$\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{P_C} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \gamma = \sum_{j=0}^m (\log(r))^j \gamma_j; \text{ such that } P_C(\gamma) = 0, \text{where} \\ \text{each } \gamma_j \text{ is a section of } E \text{ that is homogeneous of order } \lambda \end{array} \right\}. \tag{63}$$

That is, $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{P_C}$ consists of the sections of E over C in the kernel of P_C, that are polynomials in $\log(r)$ whose coefficients are sections of E over C that are homogeneous of order λ. These spaces are all finite-dimensional. This follows from the ellipticity of P_C and is discussed in [22].

The importance of the $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{P_C}$ spaces is that their dimensions tell us how the index of P changes when we cross a critical rate. The following crucial result appears in general in Lockhart–McOwen [22, §8], and can also be found explicitly for AC manifolds in [24, §6.3.2].

Theorem 4.21. *Let* $\nu < \mu$ *be two* noncritical rates *for* P*. By Theorem 4.13, the maps*

$$P_{l+r,\nu} : L^2_{l+r,\nu}(E) \to L^2_{l,\nu-r}(E)$$

and

$$P_{l+r,\mu} : L^2_{l+r,\mu}(E) \to L^2_{l,\mu-r}(E)$$

are both Fredholm. The difference in their indices is given by

$$\operatorname{ind}(P_{l+r,\mu}) - \operatorname{ind}(P_{l+r,\nu}) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}_{P_C} \cap (\nu,\mu)} \dim \mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{P_C}. \qquad \text{(AC)} \tag{64}$$

$$\operatorname{ind}(P_{l+r,\mu}) - \operatorname{ind}(P_{l+r,\nu}) = -\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}_{P_{C_i}} \cap (\nu_i,\mu_i)} \dim \mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{P_{C_i}}. \qquad \text{(CS)} \tag{65}$$

That is, the index of P *jumps precisely by the dimension of the space* $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{P_C}$ *as we cross each critical rate in the interval* (ν, μ)*. This sum is finite because the set* $\mathcal{D}_{P_C}$ *of critical rates has only finitely many points in any bounded interval.*

Let $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{P_{C_i}}$ be as in Definition 4.20. The following result can be deduced from the Lockhart–McOwen theory, and appeared in a less general form in [18, Proposition 4.27].

Proposition 4.22. *Let (M, φ) be a* G_2 *conifold of rate ν. Suppose that β_1, β_2 are two noncritical rates for P, and that $\beta_1 > \beta_2$ (AC) or $\beta_1 < \beta_2$ (CS). Suppose there exists a single critical rate for P between β_1 and β_2. This means that for some end of the manifold indexed by $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, there is a critical rate λ_0 for P_i on the cone C_i between β_1 and β_2. Suppose that $\gamma_1 \in \ker(P)_{\beta_1}$. Then there exists some $\upsilon \in \mathcal{K}(\lambda_0)_{P_{C_i}}$ and some $\tilde{\gamma}$ with $|\tilde{\gamma}|_{g_M} = O(\varrho^{\beta_1+\nu})$ such that, when restricted to the i^{th} end of M, we have*

$$\gamma_1 - (h_i^{-1})^*(\upsilon) - \tilde{\gamma} \;=\; \gamma_2 \in \ker(P)_{\beta_2}. \tag{66}$$

Notice that the term γ_2 which is in the kernel of P with noncritical rate β_2 decays faster on the end.

Remark 4.23. The $O(r^{\beta_1+\nu})$ term arises from comparing a solution of $P(\gamma) = 0$ to a solution of $P_C(\gamma) = 0$, using the relation between the metrics g_C and g_M on the end. Thus in particular the term $\tilde{\gamma}$ in (66) will vanish whenever the term $\upsilon = 0$.

Remark 4.24. Recall Theorem 4.11 says that the kernel will only change as we cross a critical rate. The essential content of Proposition 4.22 is that, when the kernel does indeed change as we cross a critical rate λ, any section which is added or removed from the kernel must be asymptotic at the i^{th} end to an element of $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{P_{C_i}}$.

Definition 4.25. Let $0 \le k \le 7$. We define the space $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$ to be the space of closed and coclosed k-forms of rate λ on the ends. Explicitly, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda \;=\; \{\gamma \in \Omega^k_{l,\lambda};\, d\gamma = 0,\, d^*_M\gamma = 0\}.$$

This definition makes sense for any $l \ge 0$, since $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$ is a subspace of $\ker(d + d^*_M)_\lambda$ where $d + d^*_M$ is acting on $\Omega^\bullet_{l,\lambda}$, and thus by Theorem 4.11 and Remark 4.17 the space $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$ is independent of l and finite-dimensional.

Given a form $\gamma \in \Omega^k$, its *pure-type* components are the components in the decompositions (1) and (2) into G_2 representations.

Lemma 4.26. *Suppose that $\lambda < -\frac{5}{2}$ (AC) or $\lambda > -\frac{5}{2}$ (CS). Then the pure-type components of an element γ in $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$ are each closed and coclosed.*

Proof. An element γ of $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$ is closed and coclosed, hence harmonic. By Remark 2.4 the projections onto the pure-type forms commute with the Laplacian, and thus the pure-type components of γ are each harmonic. Then it follows from the proof of Corollary 4.19 that the pure-type components of γ are each closed and coclosed. □

For any $0 \le k \le 7$, the space $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$ is always a subspace of $\ker(d + d^*_M)_\lambda$. Consider varying the rate λ in the direction in which the space $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$ potentially gets larger. If new elements are added to $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$, then new elements are added to $\ker(d + d^*_M)_\lambda$, and thus this can only happen when we cross a rate λ_0 which is critical for $d + d^*_M$. The next lemma says that new elements are added only when there exist closed and coclosed k-forms of rate λ_0 on the asymptotic cones.

Lemma 4.27. *Let λ_0 be a critical rate for $d + d^*_M$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ define*

$$\lambda_+ = \begin{cases} \lambda_0 + \varepsilon & \text{(AC)}, \\ \lambda_0 - \varepsilon & \text{(CS)}, \end{cases} \qquad\qquad \lambda_- = \begin{cases} \lambda_0 - \varepsilon & \text{(AC)}, \\ \lambda_0 + \varepsilon & \text{(CS)}. \end{cases}$$

Thus in either case λ_+ is a slower *rate of decay and λ_- is a* faster *rate of decay on the ends. Further choose ε small enough so that $2\varepsilon = |\lambda_+ - \lambda_-| < |\nu|$, where ν is the rate of the* G_2 *conifold, and such* *that the interval* $(\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon)$ *contains no other critical rates for* $d + d^*_M$. *Let* $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{H}^k_{\lambda_+}$. *Then equation* (66) *says that*

$$\gamma_1 - (h_i^{-1})^*(\upsilon) - \tilde{\gamma} \,=\, \gamma_2 \in \ker(d + d^*_M)_{\lambda_-} \tag{67}$$

for some $\upsilon \in \mathcal{K}(\lambda_0)_{d+d^*_{C_i}}$. *The form* υ *is a closed and coclosed* k*-form on the cone* C_i.

Proof. We give the proof in the AC case. The CS case is identical with the inequalities reversed. Since there is only one end, we drop the index i. Let $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{H}^k_{\lambda_+}$. By Proposition 4.22, we know that in equation (67) the term $\tilde{\gamma}$ satisfies $|\tilde{\gamma}|_{g_M} = O(\varrho^{\lambda_+ + \nu})$. Let υ_m and $\tilde{\gamma}_m$ denote the degree m components of υ and $\tilde{\gamma}$, for $m \neq k$. Since γ_1 is a pure degree k-form, we find that

$$(h^{-1})^*(\upsilon_m) + \tilde{\gamma}_m \text{ is } \textit{at most } O(\varrho^{\lambda_-}),$$

and $\tilde{\gamma}_m$ is *at most* $O(\varrho^{\lambda_+ + \nu})$. But our hypothesis that $\lambda_+ + \nu < \lambda_-$ allows us to absorb the $\tilde{\gamma}_m$ term on the right hand side, to conclude that υ_m is *at most* $O(\varrho^{\lambda_-})$. However, because the form υ lies in $\mathcal{K}(\lambda_0)_{d+d^*_C}$, we know in fact that if $\upsilon_m \neq 0$ then it is *at least* $O(\varrho^{\lambda_0})$, and $\lambda_0 > \lambda_-$. Thus we must have $\upsilon_m = 0$ for all $m \neq k$. Since $\upsilon \in \mathcal{K}(\lambda_0)_{d+d^*_C}$, we conclude that υ is a closed and coclosed k-form on the cone C. □

Corollary 4.28. *Let* $0 \leq k \leq 7$. *Let* λ, μ *be two noncritical rates for* $d + d^*_M$. *If there are no closed and coclosed homogeneous* k*-forms on the asymptotic cones of* M *of any rates between* λ *and* μ, *then* $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda = \mathcal{H}^k_\mu$. *In particular, we have*

$$\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda \,=\, \mathcal{H}^k_\mu \qquad \textit{if } \lambda, \mu \in (-4, -3). \tag{68}$$

Proof. We observe first that Lemma 4.27, together with Remark 4.23 and Lemma 3.8, says that the space $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$ will only change when we cross a rate λ_0 for which there exists a homogeneous closed and coclosed k-form of rate λ_0 on some asymptotic cone C_i of M. This proves the first statement. Equation (68) now follows from Proposition 3.5, which says that there are no nontrivial homogeneous closed and coclosed k-forms of any rate in $(-4, -3)$ for any G_2 cone C. □

4.3 Topological results for conifolds

The following proposition (in a general setting) appeared originally in Lockhart [23, Example 0.16], but a version in the setting of AC/CS manifolds is stated in [24, Theorem 6.5.2].

Proposition 4.29. *Let* $\mathcal{H}^k_{L^2}$ *denote the subspace of* $L^2(\Lambda^k(T^*M))$ *consisting of closed and coclosed* k*-forms. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{H}^k_{L^2} \,\cong\, H^k_{\mathrm{cs}}(M, \mathbb{R}), \ \textit{for } 0 \leq k \leq 3, \qquad &&\mathcal{H}^k_{L^2} \,\cong\, H^k(M, \mathbb{R}), \ \textit{for } 4 \leq k \leq 7, \qquad &&\textit{(AC)} \\ &\mathcal{H}^k_{L^2} \,\cong\, H^k(M, \mathbb{R}), \ \textit{for } 0 \leq k \leq 3, \qquad &&\mathcal{H}^k_{L^2} \,\cong\, H^k_{\mathrm{cs}}(M, \mathbb{R}), \ \textit{for } 4 \leq k \leq 7, \qquad &&\textit{(CS)} \end{aligned}$$

where $H^k_{\mathrm{cs}}(M, \mathbb{R})$ *denotes the degree* k *compactly supported cohomology group of* M, *and* $H^k(M, \mathbb{R})$ *denotes the degree* k *de Rham cohomology group of* M.

Corollary 4.30. *We have that*

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^3_\lambda \,&\cong\, H^3_{\mathrm{cs}}(M, \mathbb{R}) \qquad \textit{(AC)} \\ \mathcal{H}^3_\lambda \,&\cong\, H^3(M, \mathbb{R}) \qquad \textit{(CS)} \end{aligned}\right\} \quad \textit{for all } \lambda \in (-4, -3). \tag{69}$$

Proof. This is immediate from Corollary 4.28 and Proposition 4.29. □

Definition 4.31. Let $\Sigma = \sqcup_{i=1}^n \Sigma_i$ be the disjoint union of the links of the n asymptotic cones for the G_2 conifold M. Of course, in the AC case we have $n = 1$. Then $H^k(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n H^k(\Sigma_i, \mathbb{R})$. Also, by embedding each Σ_i in the i^{th} end of M, we get a smooth embedding of Σ in M, which induces a linear map

$$\Upsilon^k \,:\, H^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \to H^k(\Sigma, \mathbb{R}).$$

This linear map is most easily described as follows. Let $[\gamma] \in H^k(M, \mathbb{R})$ be a cohomology class, represented by a closed k-form γ on M. Then the i^{th} component of the class $\Upsilon^k([\gamma]) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^n H^k(\Sigma_i, \mathbb{R})$ is the class represented by the *restriction* of γ to Σ_i. Note that in general Υ^k is neither injective nor surjective.

Remark 4.32. The images of the maps Υ^k for $k = 3, 4$ are related to *topological obstructions* to the desingularization of CS G_2 conifolds, as discussed in [18, Section 5].

From [12, §2.4], any conifold M gives rise to a long exact sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow H^k_{\text{cs}}(M, \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}^k} H^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\Upsilon^k} \bigoplus_{i=1}^n H^k(\Sigma_i, \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\partial^k} H^{k+1}_{\text{cs}}(M, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \cdots \tag{70}$$

where the map $\Upsilon^k : H^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \to \bigoplus_{i=1}^n H^k(\Sigma_i, \mathbb{R})$ is precisely the map Υ^k from Definition 4.31, and the map $\mathcal{I}^k : H^k_{\text{cs}}(M, \mathbb{R}) \to H^k(M, \mathbb{R})$ is the natural map induced from inclusion of the complex of compactly supported forms into the complex of all smooth forms.

Let $b^k = \dim H^k(M, \mathbb{R})$ and $b^k_{\text{cs}} = \dim H^k_{\text{cs}}(M)$ be the ordinary and compactly supported k^{th} Betti numbers of M, respectively. Note that by Poincaré duality we have $H^k(M, \mathbb{R}) \cong H^{7-k}_{\text{cs}}(M, \mathbb{R})$ and thus $b^k = b^{7-k}_{\text{cs}}$. The next lemma contains results that will be used to compute the virtual dimension of the conifold moduli space in Section 5.2.5 and for the applications in Section 6.3.

Lemma 4.33. *Let M be a G_2 conifold. The following equations hold.*

$$b^k - \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^k) \,=\, \dim(\operatorname{im} \mathcal{I}^k) \,=\, \dim(\operatorname{im}(H^k_{\text{cs}} \to H^k)), \tag{71}$$

$$\dim(\ker \Upsilon^k) \,=\, b^k - \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^k), \tag{72}$$

$$\dim(\ker \Upsilon^k) \,=\, b^k_{\text{cs}} - \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^{7-k}). \tag{73}$$

Proof. Equation (72) is just the rank-nullity theorem. From (72) and the exactness of (70), we find

$$b^k \,=\, \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^k) + \dim(\ker \Upsilon^k) \,=\, \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^k) + \dim(\operatorname{im} \mathcal{I}^k)$$

from which we immediately obtain (71). Now using (71) and the exactness of (70), we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim(\ker \Upsilon^k) \,&=\, \dim(\operatorname{im}(H^k_{\text{cs}}(M) \to H^k(M))) \\
&=\, b^k_{\text{cs}} - \dim(\ker(H^k_{\text{cs}}(M) \to H^k(M))) \\
&=\, b^k_{\text{cs}} - \dim(\operatorname{im}(\oplus_{i=1}^n H^{k-1}(\Sigma_i) \to H^k_{\text{cs}}(M)) \\
&=\, \dim(\operatorname{coker}(\oplus_{i=1}^n H^{k-1}(\Sigma_i) \to H^k_{\text{cs}}(M))).
\end{aligned}$$

But the dimension of this cokernel is equal to the dimension of the kernel of the *adjoint map* which is easily seen to be $\Upsilon^{7-k} : H^{7-k}(M) \to \oplus_{i=1}^{n} H^{6-(k-1)}(\Sigma_i)$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(\ker \Upsilon^k) &= \dim(\ker \Upsilon^{7-k}) \\ &= b^{7-k} - \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^{7-k}) \\ &= b^k_{\mathrm{cs}} - \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^{7-k}) \end{aligned}$$

which establishes (73). □

Proposition 4.34. *Let λ_0 be a critical rate for $d + d^*_M$ (understood to be a "constant" n-tuple in the CS case), and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be chosen so that there are no other critical rates in $(\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon)$. Then for $\lambda_0 = -3$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-3+\varepsilon} - \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-3-\varepsilon} &= \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^3) \qquad (AC), \\ \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-3+\varepsilon} - \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-3-\varepsilon} &= -\dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^3) \quad (CS), \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

and for $\lambda_0 = -4$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-4+\varepsilon} - \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-4-\varepsilon} &= \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^4) \qquad (AC), \\ \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-4+\varepsilon} - \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-4-\varepsilon} &= -\dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^4) \quad (CS). \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

Proof. As usual, we prove only the AC case, because the CS case is identical with all inequalities reversed, and with n ends instead of just one. By Lemma 4.27, the space $\mathcal{H}^3_\lambda$ changes by the addition of forms that are asymptotic to closed and coclosed 3-forms in $\mathcal{K}(-3)_{d+d^*_C}$ as we cross $\lambda_0 = -3$. Also, by Lemma 3.8 and Proposition 3.10, a 3-form υ in $\mathcal{K}(-3)_{d+d^*_C}$ must be of the form $\upsilon = \beta$ for some harmonic 3-form β on Σ. Explicitly, we have that if $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{H}_{-3+\varepsilon}$, then *on the end* we have

$$\gamma_1 = (h^{-1})^*(\beta) + \tilde{\gamma} + \gamma_2,$$

where $\tilde{\gamma} + \gamma_2 = O(\varrho^{-3+\varepsilon+\nu}) + O(\varrho^{-3-\varepsilon})$. If ε is sufficiently small so that $-3 + \varepsilon + \nu < -3$, then Lemma 3.3 tells us that the 3-form component of $\tilde{\gamma} + \gamma_2$ is exact on the end. Hence, we find that $\Upsilon^3[\gamma_1] = [\beta]$, so a necessary and sufficient condition for β to define a 3-form on M which adds to $\mathcal{H}^3_\lambda$ as λ crosses $\lambda_0 = -3$ is that $[\beta] \in \operatorname{im} \Upsilon^3$. This establishes (74).

In exactly the same way, the space $\mathcal{H}^3_\lambda$ changes by the addition of forms that are asymptotic to closed and coclosed 3-forms in $\mathcal{K}(-4)_{d+d^*_C}$ as we cross $\lambda_0 = -4$. This time, Lemma 3.8 and Proposition 3.10 says that a 3-form υ in $\mathcal{K}(-4)_{d+d^*_C}$ must be of the form $\upsilon = r^{-2} dr \wedge \alpha$ for some harmonic 2-form α on Σ. But $*_M \mathcal{H}^3_\lambda = \mathcal{H}^4_\lambda$, and $*_M \upsilon = *_M(r^{-2} dr \wedge \alpha) = *_\Sigma \alpha$, a harmonic 4-form on Σ. Thus the previous argument can be repeated to conclude that changes in $\mathcal{H}^4_\lambda$ (and hence to $\mathcal{H}^3_\lambda$) as we cross $\lambda_0 = -4$ correspond to elements of $\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^4$. This establishes (75). □

The results of this section will be used in Section 5.2.5 to compute the virtual dimension of the moduli space, which will have both topological and analytic components.

4.4 Two analytic results particular to G_2 conifolds

In this section we present two analytic results that are particular to the G_2 structure, in the context of AC or CS G_2 manifolds. This first result is just a special case of [11, Proposition 10.3.4], with essentially the same proof, except that it has been adapted to the setting of conifolds. Therefore we need to make assumptions that some forms have a certain decay rate on the ends, and thus we give the proof for completeness.

Lemma 4.35. *Let (M, φ) be a G_2 conifold, so in particular $d\varphi = d\Theta(\varphi) = 0$. Suppose further that $\tilde{\varphi}$ is another* closed G_2 *structure on M such that*

$$d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi})) \, = \, \theta \wedge \psi + dX \wedge \varphi \tag{76}$$

for some 1-forms θ and X on M. Further assume that

$$\left. \begin{aligned} d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi})) \, &= \, O(\varrho^{\lambda}) \\ X \, &= \, O(\varrho^{\lambda+1}) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \text{for some } \lambda < -\frac{7}{2} \text{ (AC) or } \lambda > -\frac{7}{2} \text{ (CS).}$$

Note that this says, in particular, that both $d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi}))$ and dX are in L^2. There is a universal constant ε such that if $\tilde{\varphi}$ is within ε of φ in the C^0 norm on M, then $\theta = 0$ and $dX = 0$, so $d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi})) = 0$ and thus $\tilde{\varphi}$ is also torsion-free.

Proof. We give the proof in the AC case. The CS case is identical except that there are n ends instead of just one, and $r \to 0$ on each end instead of $r \to \infty$. Let V be a 7-dimensional vector space, with two G_2 structures φ and $\tilde{\varphi}$. It follows from simple linear algebra that if $\widetilde{\varphi}$ and φ are close with respect to the metric g_{φ} induced by φ, then the decompositions $\Lambda^5(V) = \widetilde{\Lambda}^5_7 \oplus \widetilde{\Lambda}^5_{14}$ and $\Lambda^5(V) = \Lambda^5_7 \oplus \Lambda^5_{14}$ with respect to $\tilde{\varphi}$ and φ, respectively, will also be close. In particular there exists a universal constant ε such that if $|\widetilde{\varphi} - \varphi| < \varepsilon$, using the metric $| \cdot |$ from φ, then an element $\xi \in \Lambda^5(V)$ for which $\widetilde{\pi}_7(\xi) = 0$ will also have $\pi_7(\xi)$ small enough so that $|\pi_7(\xi)| \leq |\pi_{14}(\xi)|$.

Unless stated otherwise, all our projections and inner products will be taken with respect to the G_2 structure φ. To simplify notation, we will sometimes write $\zeta = d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi}))$. We take the decomposition of (76) in $\Omega^5 = \Omega^5_7 \oplus \Omega^5_{14}$:

$$\zeta_7 = \, [d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi}))]_7 \, = \, [\theta \wedge \psi]_7 + [dX \wedge \varphi]_7 = \theta \wedge \psi - 2 * \pi_7(dX), \tag{77}$$

$$\zeta_{14} = \, [d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi}))]_{14} \, = \, [\theta \wedge \psi]_{14} + [dX \wedge \varphi]_{14} = 0 + *\pi_{14}(dX), \tag{78}$$

where we have used the Hodge stars of equations (3) and (4). Because $\tilde{\varphi}$ is closed, we know by Remark 2.3 that $\zeta = d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi}))$ lies in the space $\widetilde{\Omega}^5_{14}$, where the tilde denotes the decomposition with respect to $\tilde{\varphi}$. Hence, if $|\tilde{\varphi} - \varphi|_{C^0} < \varepsilon$, by the above remarks we have that $|\zeta_7| \leq |\zeta_{14}|$. Since we assume that $\zeta = d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi}))$ is in L^2, we can integrate over M to conclude that

$$||\zeta_7|| \, \leq ||\zeta_{14}||. \tag{79}$$

Now consider the 7-form $dX \wedge dX \wedge \varphi$, which is exact since φ is closed. By equations (3) and (4), we have

$$dX \wedge dX \wedge \varphi \, = \, dX \wedge (-2 * \pi_7(dX) + *\pi_{14}(dX)) \, = \, \left(-2|\pi_7(dX)|^2 + |\pi_{14}(dX)|^2\right) \mathsf{vol}. \tag{80}$$

The integral over M of the right hand side is finite because dX is assumed to be in L^2. To compute the integral over M of the left hand side, let $M_R = \{x \in M; \varrho(x) \leq R\}$, and observe that $\partial(M_R) = \{R\} \times \Sigma$. Hence, by Stokes' Theorem and the hypothesis that $X = O(\varrho^{\lambda+1})$, for R sufficiently large we have

$$\left| \int_{M_R} dX \wedge dX \wedge \varphi \right| = \left| \int_{\partial(M_R)} X \wedge dX \wedge \varphi \right| \leq C R^{2\lambda+1} \left| \int_{\{R\} \times \Sigma} \mathsf{vol}_{\{R\} \times \Sigma} \right| = \tilde{C} R^{2\lambda+7}$$

which goes to zero as $R \to \infty$, since $\lambda < -\frac{7}{2}$. Therefore, integrating both sides of (80) over M, we obtain

$$2||\pi_7(dX)||^2 = ||\,\pi_{14}(dX)||^2. \tag{81}$$

Similarly, we have $d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi})) \wedge dX$ is an exact 7-form, and

$$d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi})) \wedge dX = \zeta \wedge * * dX = \langle \zeta_7, *\pi_7(dX) \rangle \mathsf{vol} + \langle \zeta_{14}, *\pi_{14}(dX) \rangle \mathsf{vol}.$$

Since both $\zeta = d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi}))$ and dX are in L^2, and since $\zeta = O(\varrho^{\lambda})$ and $X = O(\varrho^{\lambda+1})$, we can argue exactly as before to integrate both sides over M to conclude that

$$\langle\langle\, \zeta_7, *\pi_7(dX)\,\rangle\rangle = -\langle\langle\, \zeta_{14}, *\pi_{14}(dX)\,\rangle\rangle = -||\zeta_{14}||^2, \tag{82}$$

using the fact that $\zeta_{14} = *\pi_{14}(dX)$ from equation (78).

Now we use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and equations (79), (81), and (82) to compute

$$\begin{aligned} ||\zeta_7||\,||\pi_7(dX)|| &= ||\zeta_7||\,||*\pi_7(dX)|| \\ &\geq -\langle\langle\, \zeta_7, *\pi_7(dX)\,\rangle\rangle \\ &= +\langle\langle\, \zeta_{14}, *\pi_{14}(dX)\,\rangle\rangle \\ &= ||\zeta_{14}||\,||*\pi_{14}(dX)|| \\ &= ||\zeta_{14}||\,||\pi_{14}(dX)|| \\ &= \sqrt{2}\,||\zeta_{14}||\,||\pi_7(dX)|| \\ &\geq \sqrt{2}\,||\zeta_7||\,||\pi_7(dX)||. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have concluded that

$$||\zeta_7||\,||\pi_7(dX)|| \geq \sqrt{2}\,||\zeta_7||\,||\pi_7(dX)||.$$

We have two cases. If $\pi_7(dX) = 0$, then by (81) we have $\pi_{14}(dX) = 0$, so $\zeta_{14} = 0$ by (78), and thus $\zeta_7 = 0$ by (79). If, on the other hand, we have $\zeta_7 = 0$, then (82) forces $\zeta_{14} = 0$, and then (78) and (81) together give $dX = 0$. In either case we also get $\theta \wedge \psi = 0$ from (77), which implies that $\theta = 0$, since wedge product with ψ is injective on 1-forms. □

Remark 4.36. The reason that Lemma 4.35 is true is because of the representation theory of G_2. Essentially, equations (3) and (4) and Stokes's theorem force the very powerful restrictions (81) and (82) on the forms $\zeta = d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi}))$ and dX. The remaining ingredients are the C^0 proximity of $\tilde{\varphi}$ and φ, together with the facts that $\tilde{\varphi}$ is closed and φ is torsion-free, which force the Ω^5_7 component of ζ to be controlled by the Ω^5_{14} component.

Remark 4.37. We also remark that in the simplified setting that we consider here, we do *not* need to assume that θ lies in L^2. In order to adapt the full generality of Joyce [11, Proposition 10.3.4] to the noncompact setting, one would need to assume that θ is in L^2.

The other result of this section is about the surjectivity of the modified Dirac operator $\breve{\not{D}}$ defined in Section 2.3 for a certain range of rates in the AC case. This result will be used to prove one case of the infinitesimal slice theorem in Section 5.2.2. Suppose that $\lambda + 1$ is a noncritical rate for $\breve{\not{D}}$. Thus the operator

$$\breve{\not{D}}_{l+1,\lambda+1} : L^2_{l+1,\lambda+1}(\Lambda^0_1 \oplus \Lambda^1_7) \to L^2_{l,\lambda}(\Lambda^3_1 \oplus \Lambda^3_7)$$

is Fredholm, and therefore by Theorem 4.15 we have

$$L^2_{l,\lambda}(\Lambda^3_1 \oplus \Lambda^3_7) \,=\, \breve{\not{D}}\left(L^2_{l+1,\lambda+1}(\Lambda^0_1 \oplus \Lambda^1_7)\right) \oplus V_\lambda, \tag{83}$$

where V_λ is a *finite-dimensional* subspace of $L^2_{l,\lambda}(\Lambda^3_1 \oplus \Lambda^3_7)$, such that

$$V_\lambda \,\cong\, \ker(\breve{\not{D}}^*)_{-7-\lambda}.$$

Lemma 4.38. *Let* (M, φ_{M}) *be an AC* G_2 *manifold. The map* $\breve{\not{D}}_{l+1,\lambda+1}$ *is surjective for all* $\lambda > -5$.

Proof. Suppose that $s = (f, X)$ lies in $\ker(\breve{\not{D}}^*)_{-7-\lambda}$. Corollary 2.14 tells us that $\Delta f = 0$ and $\Delta X = 0$. Hence f is a harmonic function and X is a harmonic 1-form on M. By the maximum principle, if f is bounded on M then it must be constant. Since the rate of decay of f at infinity is $-7-\lambda$, it will be bounded if $-7-\lambda < 0$, so it is a constant if $\lambda > -7$. But f decays to zero at infinity, so we actually have $f = 0$. Now X is a harmonic 1-form on M, so by Corollary 2.8 if ∇X lies in L^2, then $X = 0$. Since ∇X decays at rate $-7-\lambda-1 = -8-\lambda$, we find from Remark 4.3 (d) that $X = 0$ if $-8-\lambda < -\frac{7}{2}$, or $\lambda > -\frac{9}{2}$. Hence, we have shown that $\ker(\breve{\not{D}}^*)_{-7-\lambda} = 0$ for $\lambda > -\frac{9}{2}$.

Now, if $\lambda+1$ is noncritical for $\breve{\not{D}}$, then the space $V_\lambda \cong \ker(\breve{\not{D}}^*)_{-7-\lambda} = 0$ is zero if $\lambda > -\frac{9}{2}$. Thus, for such rates, (83) says that $\breve{\not{D}}_{l+1,\lambda+1}$ is *surjective.* But by Proposition 3.12, there are no critical rates for $\lambda + 1 \in (-4, -1)$, or equivalently if $\lambda \in (-5, -2)$, and hence $\breve{\not{D}}_{l+1,\lambda+1}$ is surjective for all $\lambda > -5$. □

5 The deformation theory of G_2 conifolds

In this section we study the deformation theory of G_2 conifolds. Recall that for us, a G_2 conifold (M, φ_{M}) is either an AC G_2 manifold of some rate $\nu < 0$ as in Definition 3.14 or a CS G_2 manifold of some rates $(\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n) > (0, \ldots, 0)$ as in Definition 3.18. There are some analytic difficulties that are encountered if one attempts to study deformations of AC G_2 manifolds with rate $\nu \geq -\frac{5}{2}$, which will become evident below. For this reason we will always assume that $\nu < -\frac{5}{2}$ in the AC case. Note that this includes all the known examples of AC G_2 manifolds.

In order to avoid the proliferation of too much notation, from now on all the M subscripts will be dropped. It will be understood that the Hodge star operator $*$, the covariant derivative ∇, the Hodge Laplacian Δ, the coderivative d^*, the projection maps π_k, and the maps L_φ and Q_φ defined in Lemma 2.7 will all be taken with respect to a fixed G_2 structure $\varphi = \varphi_{M}$ on M. Furthermore, we often have to deal with sections of a vector bundle E that are *smooth*, but have particular growth on the ends. Therefore we use the following notation:

$$C^\infty_\lambda(E) \,=\, \{\gamma \in C^\infty(E);\, \nabla^j s = O(\varrho^{\lambda-j})\, \forall j \geq 0\}.$$

5.1 The G_2 conifold moduli space

Let $\mathcal{T}_\nu$ denote the set of all torsion-free conifold G_2 structures on M which converge at the same rate ν on the ends to the same G_2 cones as the original conifold G_2 structure φ. Explicitly,

$$\mathcal{T}_\nu \,=\, \{\tilde{\varphi} \in \Omega^3_+(M);\, \tilde{\varphi} - \varphi \in C^\infty_\nu(\Lambda^3 T^*M),\, d\tilde{\varphi} = 0,\, d\Theta(\tilde{\varphi}) = 0\}.$$

In order to define the *moduli space* of torsion-free conifold G_2 structures on M, we need to take the quotient of $\mathcal{T}_\nu$ by an appropriate equivalence relation. The torsion-free condition is diffeomorphism invariant, but arbitrary diffeomorphisms do not preserve the convergence condition on the ends. We need to quotient out by those diffeomorphisms for which pullbacks preserve the condition $\tilde{\varphi} - \varphi \in C^\infty_\nu(\Lambda^3 T^* M)$. These diffeomorphisms are precisely those whose infinitesimal generators (vector fields) are of rate $\nu + 1$ on the ends. Specifically, we define

$$\mathcal{D}_{\nu+1} \, = \, \{\exp(X); \, X \in \Gamma(TM), \, X \in C^\infty_{\nu+1}(TM)\}.$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{D}_{\nu+1}$ acts on $\mathcal{T}_\nu$ by pullback. We now define the G_2 *conifold moduli space* $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ of rate ν on M to be the quotient space $\mathcal{M}_\nu = \mathcal{T}_\nu / \mathcal{D}_{\nu+1}$. This defines $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ as a topological space. We want to describe the structure of $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ more precisely. In the AC case, we will see that for generic rates that lie in a certain range, the space $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is actually a finite-dimensional smooth manifold. For other rates in the AC case, and in general for the CS case, the deformation theory will be obstructed and we will describe the obstruction spaces explicitly.

Both $\mathcal{T}_\nu$ and the orbits of $\mathcal{D}_{\nu+1}$ are infinite-dimensional smooth manifolds. Their tangent spaces are described as follows. Consider a smooth curve $F_t = \exp(tX)$ in $\mathcal{D}_{\nu+1}$, where $X \in C^\infty_{\nu+1}(TM)$. This path passes through the identity diffeomorphism $F_0 = \mathrm{Id}_M$ at $t = 0$. Therefore, the tangent space $T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{\nu+1} \cdot \varphi)$ at φ to the orbit $\mathcal{D}_{\nu+1} \cdot \varphi$ is spanned by elements of the form $\frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} (F_t^* \varphi) = \mathcal{L}_X \varphi = d(X \lrcorner \varphi)$. Thus we have

$$T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{\nu+1} \cdot \varphi) \, = \, d\left(C^\infty_\nu(\Lambda^2_7(T^* M))\right). \tag{84}$$

Similarly, let φ_t be a smooth path in $\mathcal{T}_\nu$ passing through φ at $t = 0$. Thus φ_t is a torsion-free G_2 structure for all t, and therefore by Lemma 2.7 we have that the 3-form $\eta = \frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} \varphi_t$ satisfies $d\eta = 0$ and $\frac{4}{3} d^* \pi_1(\eta) + d^* \pi_7(\eta) - d^* \pi_{27}(\eta) = 0$, where the projections are taken with respect to the G_2 structure $\varphi = \varphi_0$. Hence we have shown that

$$T_\varphi \mathcal{T}_\nu \, = \, \{\eta \in C^\infty_\nu(\Lambda^3 T^* M); \, d\eta = 0, \, d(L_\varphi(\eta)) = 0\}, \tag{85}$$

where

$$L_\varphi(\eta) \, = \, \frac{4}{3} * \pi_1(\eta) + * \pi_7(\eta) - * \pi_{27}(\eta)$$

is the linearization of Θ at φ defined in equation (15). If $\mathcal{M}_\nu = \mathcal{T}_\nu / \mathcal{D}_{\nu+1}$ were indeed a smooth manifold, then we would have that

$$T_{[\varphi]} \mathcal{M}_\nu \, \oplus \, T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{\nu+1} \cdot \varphi) \, = \, T_\varphi \mathcal{T}_\nu. \tag{86}$$

Thus, one of ours goals will be to use (84) and (85) to find a direct complement of $T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{\nu+1} \cdot \varphi)$ in $T_\varphi \mathcal{T}_\nu$. This will tell us what the "tangent space" at $[\varphi]$ to $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ would have to be. Then we will use the Banach space implicit function theorem in the right way to describe the structure of $\mathcal{M}_\nu$.

The main theorem that we prove in the next section about the G_2 conifold moduli space is the following.

Theorem 5.1. *Let (M, φ) be a G_2 conifold, asymptotic to particular G_2 cones on the ends, at some rate ν. Let $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ be the moduli space of all torsion-free G_2 structures on M, asymptotic to the same cones on the ends, at the same rate ν, modulo the appropriate notion of equivalence that preserves these conditions. Then for generic ν (for all but a set of critical rates, which is finite in any bounded interval), we have*

- *In the asymptotically conical (AC) case, if $\nu \in (-4, -\frac{5}{2})$, then $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is a* smooth manifold *whose dimension consists of topological and analytic contributions, given precisely in Corollary 5.38.*
- *In the AC case when $\nu < -4$, or in the conically singular (CS) case for any $\nu > 0$, then $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is in general only a* topological space*, and the deformation theory may be obstructed. The virtual dimension again consists of topological and analytic contributions, given precisely in Corollary 5.38.*

5.2 Proof of the main theorem

In this section we prove Theorem 5.1 on the deformation theory of G_2 conifolds.

Recall that in the AC case, we always assume that $\nu < -\frac{5}{2}$. Some of the intermediate results that will be needed actually work up to rates greater than $-\frac{5}{2}$. Whenever possible, we state results with their most general range of validity. However, the upper bound for which all the results that we need will be true is $\nu < -\frac{5}{2}$. In the CS case, we always assume that $\nu = (\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n) > (0, \ldots, 0)$. Some of the analytic results will hold if each $\nu_i > -\frac{5}{2}$, but we do not always state this explicitly, since such rates are unreasonable because the G_2 structure φ will not converge to the cone structure φ_{C_i} at the i^{th} end unless $\nu_i > 0$.

Remark 5.2. The ingredients in the proofs of the main theorems have two distinct flavours, depending on which of the following two situations we are considering:

- In the L^2 setting (when $\nu < -\frac{7}{2}$ for the AC case or for any $\nu > 0$ in the CS case), many of the analytic arguments are simple, but this is precisely the regime in which *obstructions* occur.
- In the AC case when $\nu > -\frac{7}{2}$, we are not in L^2, and because of this most of the analytic arguments are more delicate. For example, we need to use the surjectivity of the Dirac operator to prove our infinitesimal slice theorem. However, this regime has the nice feature of having an *unobstructed* deformation theory.

The proof of Theorem 5.1 is broken up into the following five steps.

Step 1: We derive Hodge theory results for the spaces of 2-forms and 3-forms with specified rates of decay on the ends. These results are used repeatedly in many later parts of the proof.

Step 2: We prove a slice theorem, showing that the space of torsion-free gauge-fixed G_2 structures with the correct asymptotics on the ends is homeomorphic to the G_2 conifold moduli space.

Step 3: We demonstrate that the space of torsion-free gauge-fixed G_2 structures with the correct asymptotics on the ends is locally isomorphic to the zero set of a smooth nonlinear map.

Step 4: We use the Banach space implicit function theorem to describe the structure of this zero set, and explain when it is a smooth manifold.

Step 5: We compute the (expected) dimension of the G_2 conifold moduli space in terms of topological and analytic data.

5.2.1 Step 1: Hodge theory results for 3-forms and 2-forms

In this section we use Fredholm theory of the operator $d + d^*$ to determine Hodge theory results for the spaces of 3-forms and 2-forms. Recall from Definition 4.25 that $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$ is the space of closed and coclosed k-forms of rate λ on the ends.

The Hodge theory results we establish are slightly different for the two settings described in Remark 5.2, so we state and prove them separately.

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose $\lambda + 1$ is noncritical for $d + d^*$. Let $0 \leq k \leq 7$. In the L^2 setting (when $\lambda < -\frac{7}{2}$ for the AC case or when $\lambda > -\frac{7}{2}$ for the CS case), we have the decomposition*

$$\Omega^k_{l,\lambda} \;=\; d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus \mathcal{H}^k_\lambda \oplus W^k_\lambda, \tag{87}$$

where W^k_λ is a finite-dimensional space, and the direct sums are all orthogonal with respect to the L^2 inner product.

Proof. In this range of rates, we can integrate by parts. Hence $d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$ is L^2-orthogonal to $d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$ and in particular these two subspaces have trivial intersection. Since $\lambda+1$ is noncritical, the space $(d+d^*)(\Omega^{\bullet}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$ is closed in $\Omega^{\bullet}_{l,\lambda}$ and of finite codimension. Then in particular, the image of this closed subspace under the orthogonal projection $P^k : \Omega^{\bullet}_{l,\lambda} \to \Omega^k_{l,\lambda}$ is also closed. That is,

$$P^k\left((d + d^*)(\Omega^{\bullet}_{l+1,\lambda+1})\right) \;=\; d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$$

is closed in $\Omega^k_{l,\lambda}$. Because $\operatorname{im}(d + d^*) \subseteq \operatorname{im} d + \operatorname{im} d^*$, we see that $d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$ is of finite codimension in $\Omega^k_{l,\lambda}$. Note that in general $\operatorname{im}(d+d^*)$ will be of positive (finite) codimension in the space $\operatorname{im} d + \operatorname{im} d^*$. Define U^k_λ to be the intersection with $\Omega^k_{l,\lambda}$ of the L^2-orthogonal complement of $d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$. Thus we have

$$\Omega^k_{l,\lambda} \;=\; d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus U^k_\lambda.$$

We claim that $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda \subseteq U^k_\lambda$. To see this, suppose $\eta = d\alpha + d^*\beta + \gamma$ is in $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$, with $\gamma \in U^k_\lambda$. We find that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;&=\; \langle\langle d^*\eta, \alpha\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle \eta, d\alpha\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle d\alpha + d^*\beta + \gamma, d\alpha\rangle\rangle = ||d\alpha||^2 + 0 + 0, \\ 0 \;&=\; \langle\langle d\eta, \beta\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle \eta, d^*\beta\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle d\alpha + d^*\beta + \gamma, d^*\beta\rangle\rangle = 0 + ||d^*\beta||^2 + 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that U^k_λ is L^2-orthogonal to $d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$. Thus $d\alpha = 0$ and $d^*\beta = 0$, so $\eta = \gamma \in U^k_\lambda$. This establishes the claim. Now let W^k_λ be the intersection with U^k_λ of the L^2-orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$. $\square$

Remark 5.4. We pause here to note that in general the space U^k_λ will be *strictly larger* than $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$, because while any γ in U^k_λ is L^2-orthogonal to exact and coexact k-forms of rate λ, this does not imply that γ is closed and coclosed. This is because, for example, $0 = \langle\langle \gamma, d\alpha\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle d^*\gamma, \alpha\rangle\rangle$ for all $\alpha \in \Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}$ does not imply that $d^*\gamma = 0$ because we cannot set $\alpha = d^*\gamma$, since $\gamma \in \Omega^k_{l,\lambda}$ and therefore $d^*\gamma \in \Omega^{k-1}_{l-1,\lambda-1} \not\subseteq \Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}$.

Corollary 5.5. *The dimension of the space W^k_λ is given by*

$$\dim W^k_\lambda \;=\; \dim \mathcal{H}^k_{-7-\lambda} - \dim \mathcal{H}^k_\lambda. \tag{88}$$

Proof. By Remark 4.16, since the subspace $d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$ of $\Omega^k_{l,\lambda}$ is closed, any direct complement of it will be isomorphic to its annihilator in the dual space. It is trivial to see that this annihilator is the space $\mathcal{H}^k_{-7-\lambda}$ of closed and coclosed forms of the dual rate $-7-\lambda$, using the fact that the dual space of $\Omega^k_{l,\lambda}$ is $\Omega^k_{-l,-7-\lambda}$ and Remark 4.14. Thus $\dim U^k_\lambda = \dim \mathcal{H}^k_{-7-\lambda}$, and since $W^k_\lambda \cong U^k_\lambda / \mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$, equation (88) follows immediately. $\square$

The next result is the analogue to Proposition 5.3 for the AC case when $\lambda > -4$.

Proposition 5.6. *Suppose $\lambda + 1$ is noncritical for $d + d^*$. Let $0 \leq k \leq 7$. In the AC case when $\lambda > -4$, we have the decomposition*

$$\Omega^k_{l,\lambda} \;=\; A^k_\lambda \oplus B^k_\lambda \oplus \mathcal{H}^k_{-7-\lambda} \;=\; A^k_\lambda \oplus \mathcal{H}^k_\lambda, \tag{89}$$

where B^k_λ is the intersection of $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$ with the Banach space $d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) + d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$, and A^k_λ is a topological complement of B^k_λ in $d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) + d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$, and thus a closed subspace. Moreover, in A^k_λ the intersection of the images of d and d^* is zero.

Proof. We prove this proposition for $\lambda > -\frac{7}{2}$ and explain in Remark 5.7 below why it actually holds for $\lambda > -4$. We begin by noting that, just as in the proof of Proposition 5.3, we have

$$d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) + d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \;=\; P^k\left((d + d^*)(\Omega^\bullet_{l+1,\lambda+1})\right)$$

is closed in $\Omega^k_{l,\lambda}$. The argument from the proof of Corollary 5.5 applies here, so any topological complement of $d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) + d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$ will be isomorphic to $\mathcal{H}^k_{-7-\lambda}$. However, since $\lambda > -\frac{7}{2}$ is equivalent to $-7 - \lambda < \lambda$, we see that $\mathcal{H}^k_{-7-\lambda}$ actually lies in $\Omega^k_{l,\lambda}$ and thus we can write

$$\Omega^k_{l,\lambda} \;=\; \Big(d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) + d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})\Big) \oplus \mathcal{H}^k_{-7-\lambda}.$$

Let B^k_λ be the intersection of $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$ with $d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) + d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$ and let A^k_λ be a topological complement of the finite-dimensional space B^k_λ in the Banach space $d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) + d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$. We thus have

$$\Omega^k_{l,\lambda} \;=\; A^k_\lambda \oplus B^k_\lambda \oplus \mathcal{H}^k_{-7-\lambda}$$

with $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda = B^k_\lambda \oplus \mathcal{H}^k_{-7-\lambda}$. Finally, suppose $\eta = d\alpha = d^*\beta$ in A^k_λ. Then η is both closed and coclosed, and thus lies in $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$. Since $A^k_\lambda \cap \mathcal{H}^k_\lambda = \{0\}$, we have $\eta = 0$. ☐

Remark 5.7. Suppose we are in the AC case. If $\lambda \in (-4, -\frac{7}{2})$, then $-7 - \lambda \in (-\frac{7}{2}, -3)$, and hence Corollary 4.28 and Corollary 5.5 tell us that $W^k_\lambda = 0$. Thus Proposition 5.3 then says

$$\Omega^k_{l,\lambda} \;=\; d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus \mathcal{H}^k_\lambda.$$

Similarly, if $\lambda \in (-\frac{7}{2}, -3)$, then $-7 - \lambda \in (-4, -\frac{7}{2})$, and hence Corollary 4.28 and $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda = B^k_\lambda \oplus \mathcal{H}^k_{-7-\lambda}$ tell us that $B^k_\lambda = 0$. Therefore in this case Proposition 5.6 says $A^k_\lambda = d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1})$, and

$$\Omega^k_{l,\lambda} \;=\; d(\Omega^{k-1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus d^*(\Omega^{k+1}_{l+1,\lambda+1}) \oplus \mathcal{H}^k_\lambda.$$

Since $\mathcal{H}^k_\lambda$ is independent of $\lambda \in (-4, -3)$, we have established that in the interval $(-4, -3)$ the two decompositions (87) and (89) are identical. Thus we conclude that Proposition 5.6 actually holds for all $\lambda > -4$.

We are now ready for the main results of this section, which are Hodge-type decompositions for 3-forms and 2-forms on G_2 conifolds. For this purpose we will require the preceding results for 3-forms when $\lambda = \nu$ and for 2-forms when $\lambda = \nu + 1$, where ν is the rate of the G_2 conifold.

Theorem 5.8. *Let (M, φ) be a G_2 conifold of rate ν, and suppose that $\nu + 1$ is a noncritical rate for $d + d^*$. Let $\eta \in \Omega^3_{l,\nu}$.*

- *In the L^2 setting (when $\nu < -\frac{7}{2}$ for the AC case or for any $\nu > 0$ in the CS case), we can express the* 3*-form η, in a* unique way*, as*

$$\eta \,=\, d\alpha + d^*\beta + \kappa + \gamma, \tag{90}$$

where $\alpha \in \Omega^2_{l+1,\nu+1}$, $\beta \in \Omega^4_{l+1,\nu+1}$, $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}^3_\nu$, and γ is in W^3_ν. Moreover, if $d\eta = 0$, then the component $d^*\beta = 0$. Thus when $d\eta = 0$ we can write

$$\eta \,=\, d\alpha + \kappa + \gamma \tag{91}$$

where $\gamma \in W^3_\nu$ and $d\gamma = 0$.

- *In the AC case when $\nu \in (-4, 0)$, we can express the* 3*-form η, in a* unique way*, as*

$$\eta \,=\, d\alpha + d^*\beta + \kappa, \tag{92}$$

where $d\alpha + d^*\beta \in A^3_\nu$ and $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}^3_\nu$. Moreover, if $d\eta = 0$, then $d^*\beta = 0$. In this case we write

$$\eta \,=\, d\alpha + \kappa. \tag{93}$$

Proof. Equations (90) and (92) follow immediately from Propositions 5.3 and 5.6. Now suppose that $d\eta = 0$.

In the L^2 setting corresponding to equation (90) we have $d(d^*\beta + \gamma) = 0$. But the space W^3_ν is L^2-orthogonal to $d^*(\Omega^4_{l+1,\nu+1})$, so we find that

$$||d^*\beta||^2 = \langle\langle d^*\beta, d^*\beta + \gamma\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle\, \beta, d(d^*\beta + \gamma)\,\rangle\rangle = 0,$$

so $d^*\beta = 0$ as claimed. We have established (91).

In the AC case when $\nu \in (-4, 0)$ corresponding to equation (92) we get $d(d^*\beta) = 0$, so $d^*\beta$ is both closed and coclosed, and thus lies in $\mathcal{H}^3_\nu$. But Proposition 5.6 says that the coexact forms in A^3_ν are transverse to $\mathcal{H}^3_\nu$, and hence $d^*\beta = 0$. □

The decomposition of the space of 3-forms in Theorem 5.8 will be an essential tool in the proof of our main theorems, and we will use it repeatedly in the rest of Section 5.2.

We will also need a result about 2-forms, but only in the AC case for $\nu \in (-4, 0)$, in order to prove the corresponding version of the infinitesimal slice theorem in Section 5.2.2.

Lemma 5.9. *Let (M, φ) be an AC G_2 manifold of rate $\nu \in (-4, 0)$, and suppose that $\nu + 2$ is a noncritical rate for $d{+}d^*$. Suppose $\alpha \in \Omega^2_{l+1,\nu+1}$. Then there is a* unique *coexact* 2*-form $\sigma \in \Omega^2_{l+1,\nu+1}$ such that*

$$d\alpha \,=\, d\sigma. \tag{94}$$

Proof. Applying Proposition 5.6 to α, there is a unique decomposition

$$\alpha \,=\, d\omega + d^*\zeta + \rho,$$

where $d\omega + d^*\zeta$ lies in $A^2_{\nu+1}$, and $\rho \in \mathcal{H}^2_{\nu+1}$ is closed and coclosed. Let $\sigma = d^*\zeta$, so $d\alpha = d\sigma$. □

Remark 5.10. We can ensure that $\nu + 2$ and $\nu + 1$ are both simultaneously noncritical for $d + d^*$, because there are only finitely many critical rates for this operator in any bounded interval.

5.2.2 Step 2: Gauge-fixing and the slice theorem

In order to break the diffeomorphism invariance, we need to prove a "slice theorem" that establishes a local homeomorphism between the space of G_2 structures satisfying a particular condition modulo diffeomorphisms which preserve this condition, and a space of solutions to a system of differential equations. Ideally, we would like to prove this slice theorem directly for torsion-free G_2 structures which have prescribed cone-like behaviour on the ends. However, the fact the the torsion-free condition is *nonlinear* makes it difficult to do this directly. Instead, we first prove a slice theorem for the space of *closed* G_2 structures with prescribed cone-like behaviour on the ends, which is a linear condition, and then in Section 5.2.3 we impose the torsion-free condition to describe a smaller subset of this space.

Our approach to the slice theorem for closed G_2 structures is very similar to that of Nordström [36], who considers the asymptotically cylindrical case. A more detailed treatment is in [35], to which we will occasionally refer. To begin, we need to find a direct complement of the tangent space to the space of diffeomorphisms that preserve the cone-like behaviour of the appropriate rate on the ends, within the space of closed 3-forms with the same decay at the ends. In order to later apply the Banach space implicit function theorem to determine the structure of the moduli space, we will need to consider (weighted) Sobolev spaces of forms, and thus we actually need to establish a "slice theorem" for forms in such weighted Sobolev spaces.

Within the space $\Omega^3_{l,\nu}$, the role of the infinitesimal diffeomorphisms defined in equation (84) is played by the 3-forms that are the exterior derivative of a 2-form of type Λ^2_7 in the appropriate Sobolev space. Explicitly, we define

$$\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} = \{\exp(X);\, X \in \Gamma(TM),\, X \in L^2_{l+1,\nu+1}(T^*M)\}.$$

and thus the tangent space to the orbit $\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} \cdot \varphi$ at φ is given by

$$T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} \cdot \varphi) = d\left(L^2_{l+1,\nu+1}(\Lambda^2_7(T^*M))\right) \subseteq \Omega^3_{l,\nu}.$$

Similarly, in $\Omega^3_{l,\nu}$ the tangent space at φ to the closed G_2 structures $\mathcal{C}_{l,\nu}$ that are asymptotic to φ with rate ν is given by

$$T_\varphi \mathcal{C}_{l,\nu} = \{\eta \in \Omega^3_{l,\nu}\,;\, d\eta = 0\}.$$

Definition 5.11. Given a rate ν, define $T_\varphi \mathcal{S}_{l,\nu}$ to be the following subspace of $\Omega^3_{l,\nu}$:

$$T_\varphi \mathcal{S}_{l,\nu} = \{\eta \in \Omega^3_{l,\nu}\,;\, d\eta = 0,\, \pi_7(d^*\eta) = 0\}.$$

Note that $T_\varphi \mathcal{S}_{l,\nu}$ is a proper subspace of $T_\varphi \mathcal{C}_{l,\nu}$, corresponding to the "gauge-fixed" infinitesimal deformations of closed G_2 structures, given by Definition 2.16.

We can now state the first result of this subsection, which is an infinitesimal version of our slice theorem.

Theorem 5.12. *Suppose that $\nu \leq -1$ (AC) or $\nu > 0$ (CS). Then we have the following direct sum decomposition of $T_\varphi \mathcal{C}_{l,\nu}$:*

$$T_\varphi \mathcal{C}_{l,\nu} = T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} \cdot \varphi) \oplus T_\varphi \mathcal{S}_{l,\nu}. \tag{95}$$

Proof. The proof has a very different flavour in the two cases:

[1] the L^2 setting: AC when $\nu < -\frac{7}{2}$, or CS for any $\nu > 0$;

[2] the non-L^2 setting: AC when $\nu \in (-4,-1]$.

Case [1]: In L^2 we can integrate by parts. If $Y \in L^2_{l+1,\nu+1}(TM)$, we have $d(Y \lrcorner \varphi) \in T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} \cdot \varphi)$. Thus a form $\eta \in \Omega^3_{l,\nu}$ is L^2-orthogonal to $T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} \cdot \varphi)$ if and only if

$$0 = \langle\langle d(Y \lrcorner \varphi), \eta \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle Y \lrcorner \varphi, d^*\eta \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle Y \lrcorner \varphi, \pi_7(d^*\eta) \rangle\rangle \qquad \text{for all } Y.$$

Thus in this case $T_\varphi \mathcal{S}_{l,\nu}$ is precisely the intersection with $T_\varphi \mathcal{C}_{l,\nu}$ of the L^2-orthogonal complement of $T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} \cdot \varphi)$. Since it is clear that $T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} \cdot \varphi)$ is a subspace of $T_\varphi \mathcal{C}_{l,\nu}$, equation (95) now follows.

Case [2]: Let η be in $T_\varphi \mathcal{C}_{l,\nu}$. We will show that η can be written as the sum of an element of $T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} \cdot \varphi)$ and an element of $T_\varphi \mathcal{S}_{l,\nu}$, and then show that the intersection of these two subspaces is trivial. Since η is closed, Theorem 5.8 and Lemma 5.9 say that we can write $\eta = \kappa + d\widehat{\sigma}$ for some $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}^3_\nu$ and some coexact $\widehat{\sigma}$. By Lemma 4.38, the modified Dirac operator $\breve{\not{D}}$ is surjective, so there exists a pair $(h, -Y) \in L^2_{l+1,\nu+1}(\Lambda^0_1 \oplus \Lambda^1_7)$ such that

$$\pi_{1+7}(d\widehat{\sigma}) = *(dh \wedge \varphi) + \pi_{1+7}(d(Y \lrcorner \varphi)).$$

Since $*(dh \wedge \varphi)$ is pointwise of type Λ^3_7, the above equation says that

$$d\widehat{\sigma} - d(Y \lrcorner \varphi) \; = \; *(dh \wedge \varphi) + \eta_{27} \tag{96}$$

for some η_{27} pointwise of type Λ^3_{27}. Define $\sigma = \widehat{\sigma} - (Y \lrcorner \varphi)$, which is an element of $\Omega^2_{l+1,\nu+1}$. Let $\zeta = d\sigma$ denote the right hand side of (96). We have $d\zeta = 0$, and ζ is of the form (28) with $f = 0$ and $X = dh$. Because $\operatorname{curl} X = \operatorname{curl}(dh) = 0$, we can apply Lemma 2.18 to conclude that $\pi_7 d^*\zeta = 0$. Since κ is coclosed, we find that $\eta = d(Y \lrcorner \varphi) + \kappa + d\sigma$ with $\pi_7 d^*(\kappa + d\sigma) = 0$. But $d(Y \lrcorner \varphi)$ is in $T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} \cdot \varphi)$ and thus the difference $\eta - d(Y \lrcorner \varphi) = \kappa + d\sigma$ is in $T_\varphi \mathcal{S}_{l,\nu}$, as required.

To compete the proof of case [2] it remains to show that $T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} \cdot \varphi) \cap T_\varphi \mathcal{S}_{l,\nu} = \{0\}$. Let $d(X \lrcorner \varphi)$ lie in this intersection. Let $\mu = X \lrcorner \varphi$, and recall from Lemma 5.9 that we can find a unique 2-form β such that $d\beta = d\mu$ and $d^*\beta = 0$. We also have $\pi_7(d^*d\beta) = \pi_7(d^*d\mu) = 0$. Let $\pi_7\beta = Y \lrcorner \varphi$. From Lemma 2.19 we can conclude that $\Delta Y = 0$. But $\beta \in L^2_{l+1,\nu+1}(\Lambda^2_7(T^*M))$, so $Y \in L^2_{l+1,\nu+1}(TM)$. Now using Proposition 3.6 on the excluded range of harmonic 1-forms and Theorem 4.11 on the invariance of the kernel we conclude that if $\nu + 1 \leq 0$, then in fact we can say that Y is actually $O(r^{\nu'+1})$ where $\nu' + 1 = -4 + \varepsilon < -\frac{7}{2}$. This certainly implies that ∇Y is in L^2, and thus we can use Corollary 2.8 to conclude that $Y = 0$, and hence $\pi_7\beta = 0$. Therefore β is coclosed and of type Λ^2_{14}. Proposition 2.5 then tells us that $d\beta$ is of type Λ^3_{27}. Since $d\mu = d\beta$, Corollary 2.15 gives $d^*X = 0$ and $\operatorname{curl} X = 0$, so $\not{D}(0, X) = 0$ and thus $\Delta X = 0$ by (19) and (20). Now the argument that was used above for Y also applies to X. We conclude that $X = 0$ and thus $d(X \lrcorner \varphi) = 0$. $\square$

If we now define a map $\exp_\varphi : T_\varphi \mathcal{S}_{l,\nu} \to \mathcal{C}_{l,\nu}$ by affine translation, namely

$$\exp_\varphi(\eta) \; = \; \varphi + \eta,$$

then it is clear that the image $\mathcal{S}_{l,\nu} = \exp_\varphi(T_\varphi S_{l,\nu})$ is an (infinite-dimensional) smooth submanifold of $\mathcal{C}_{l,\nu}$ whose tangent space at φ is exactly $T_\varphi \mathcal{S}_{l,\nu}$, justifying our choice of notation. We would like to conclude that, near the point φ, the space $S_{l,\nu}$ contains exactly one representative from each orbit of the action of the diffeomorphisms in $\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1}$. More precisely, we want to establish that, near φ, the space $\mathcal{S}_{l,\nu}$ is homeomorphic to $\mathcal{C}_{l,\nu}/\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1}$. In fact, we can establish the stronger result that near φ, the space of *torsion-free* elements in $\mathcal{S}_{l,\nu}$ is homeomorphic to our moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\nu}$. The details of this argument are discussed in Nordström [35, Section 3.1]. Our situation admits several nice features that allow us to use the simplifications that Nordström explains in [35, Section 3.1.3], which we now briefly discuss.

We define $\mathcal{R}_{l,\nu} = \mathcal{S}_{l,\nu} \cap \mathcal{T}$ to be the torsion-free G_2 structures in $\mathcal{S}_{l,\nu}$. The content of Corollary 5.16 in the next section is that $R_{l,\nu}$ consists of smooth elements, so we can drop the subscript l on $\mathcal{R}_{l,\nu} = \mathcal{R}_{\nu}$ and we able to use [35, Theorem 3.1.4].

Next, we observe that isotropy subgroup $\mathcal{I}_{\varphi}$ of φ under the action of $\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1}$ is *trivial.* To see this, first note that a diffeomorphism in $\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1}$ generated by a vector field X that preserves the G_2 structure φ is also an isometry, so $\mathcal{L}_X g = 0$ and it is well known that this implies that $d^* X = 0$. Since our metric is Ricci-flat, another well known argument using the Ricci identities and the Bochner–Weitzenböck formula then implies that $\Delta X = 0$. But then in the L^2 case we can apply Corollary 2.8 to conclude that $X = 0$ and in the AC case when $\nu \in (-4, -1]$ we can argue exactly as in the last paragraph of the proof of Theorem 5.12 above to again conclude that $X = 0$. Thus in all cases, the isotropy group $\mathcal{I}_{\varphi} = \{1\}$ as claimed.

Thus, we can conclude as in [35, page 51], that the space $\mathcal{R}_{\nu}$ is locally homeomorphic to an open neighbourhood of $[\varphi]$ in $\mathcal{M}_{\nu}$. So the problem of understanding the local structure of $\mathcal{M}_{\nu}$ reduces to understanding $\mathcal{R}_{\nu}$. We summarize the preceding discussion in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.13. *Let* $\mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon}_{l,\nu} = \{\eta \in \Omega^3_{l,\nu};\ |\eta|_{C^0} < \varepsilon, d\eta = 0, d(\Theta(\varphi + \eta)) = 0, \pi_7(d^*\eta) = 0\}$ *be the space parametrizing the torsion-free gauge-fixed* G_2 *structures close to* φ*. Then for* ε *sufficiently small, the space* $\mathcal{R}_{l,\nu}$ *is independent of* l *and is homemorphic to an open neighbourhood of* $\mathcal{D}_{\nu+1} \cdot \varphi$ *in* $\mathcal{M}_{\nu}$*.*

5.2.3 Step 3: Local one-to-one correspondence with solutions of an elliptic PDE

In this section we establish a (local) one-to-one correspondence between (i) gauge-fixed torsion-free G_2 structures with the same conical asymptotics on the ends as φ that are sufficiently C^0-close to φ; and (ii) solutions of a nonlinear elliptic partial differential equation on M.

Let (M, φ) be a G_2 conifold of rate ν. As always, we assume $\nu > 0$ in the CS case and $\nu < -\frac{5}{2}$ in the AC case, although one part of Theorem 5.14 works in the AC case up to $\nu < 0$. This will have very important applications in Section 6.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be the constant from Lemma 4.35. Consider the set of G_2 structures $\tilde{\varphi}$ that are asymptotic, at the same rate ν, to the same G_2 cones on the ends, which are ε-close to φ in the C^0 norm, such that the difference $\tilde{\varphi} - \varphi$ lies in $\Omega^3_{l,\nu}$. Using Theorem 5.8, we can write $\eta = \tilde{\varphi} - \varphi$ in a unique way as

$$\eta = \tilde{\varphi} - \varphi \; = \; \kappa + d\alpha + \gamma, \tag{97}$$

where $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}^3_{\nu}$, the 2-form α is in $\Omega^2_{l+1,\nu+1}$, and γ is a *closed* form in W^3_{ν}. For convenience we will often write

$$\eta = \tilde{\varphi} - \varphi \; = \; \kappa + \zeta, \qquad \text{where } \zeta = d\alpha + \gamma. \tag{98}$$

Theorem 5.14. *Consider the subset of* torsion-free and gauge-fixed G_2 *structures* $\tilde{\varphi}$ *that are* ε*-close to* φ *in the* C^0 *norm and such that* $\tilde{\varphi} - \varphi$ *lies in* $\Omega^3_{l,\nu}$*. Specifically, these are the* G_2 *structures* $\tilde{\varphi}$ *expressed in the form* (97) *such that* $\eta = \tilde{\varphi} - \varphi$ *satisfies*

$$d\eta = 0 \;\; \textit{and} \;\; d\Theta(\varphi + \eta) = 0 \;\; \textit{and} \;\; \pi_7(d^*\eta) = 0. \tag{99}$$

That is, $\eta \in \mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon}_{l,\nu}$ *as defined in Theorem 5.13. Consider also the following nonlinear elliptic equation:*

$$(d + d^*)(\eta) = d^* * (Q_\varphi(\eta)). \tag{100}$$

In the CS case ($\nu > 0$) *and in the AC case* for all rates $\nu < 0$, *we always have that small* ($|\eta|_{C^0} < \varepsilon$) *3-forms* $\eta \in \Omega^3_{l,\nu}$ *that satisfy* (99) *are solutions in* Ω^3_ν *of* (100)*. That is, we always have, for any* G_2 *conifolds, that* (99) *implies* (100).

Moreover, in the CS case, and in the AC case if $\nu < -\frac{5}{2}$, *then there is a one-to-one correspondence between small* ($|\eta|_{C^0} < \varepsilon$) *3-forms* $\eta \in \Omega^3_{l,\nu}$ *that satisfy* (99) *and solutions in* Ω^3_ν *of* (100).

Proof. First we establish an identity (101) that will be used to prove both directions of this theorem. If we substitute $\eta = \kappa + \zeta$ into equation (16) and simplify using equation (15), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} *d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi})) &= -d^* * (L_\varphi(\kappa + \zeta)) - d^* * (Q_\varphi(\eta)) \\ &= -d^* \left(\frac{4}{3}\pi_1(\kappa + \zeta) + \pi_7(\kappa + \zeta) - \pi_{27}(\kappa + \zeta) \right) - d^* * (Q_\varphi(\eta)). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.26 we know that the pure-type components $\pi_1(\kappa)$, $\pi_7(\kappa)$, and $\pi_{27}(\kappa)$ are each closed and coclosed, and thus all the linear terms involving κ vanish. Therefore if we add and subtract $d^*\zeta = d^*\eta$ we find that

$$* \, d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi})) = -\frac{7}{3} d^* \pi_1(\zeta) - 2 d^* \pi_7(\zeta) + d^*\eta - d^* * (Q_\varphi(\eta)). \tag{101}$$

Now suppose that (99) holds. The third equation of this set is exactly the gauge-fixing condition $\pi_7(d^*\eta) = 0$. Since κ is coclosed, this is equivalent to $\pi_7(d^*\zeta) = 0$. Write ζ in the form (27). Since $\zeta \in \Omega^3_{l,\nu}$, we have ∇f and ∇X are of rate $\nu - 1$. In the CS case, this means both ∇f and ∇X are in L^2. Thus we can apply Lemma 2.17 to conclude that $f = c$ is a constant and $X = 0$. Hence we have $\zeta = c\varphi + \pi_{27}\zeta$. In particular, we get

$$d^*\pi_1(\zeta) = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad d^*\pi_7(\zeta) = 0. \tag{102}$$

In the AC case, we have to argue slightly differently. Since $d^*\zeta$ is in Ω^2_{14} and is coclosed, we can use Proposition 2.5, and the fact that $d\zeta = 0$, to conclude that $dd^*\zeta = \Delta\zeta \in \Omega^3_{27}$. Thus because the Laplacian commutes with the projections, we have

$$\Delta(\pi_1(\zeta)) = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Delta(\pi_7(\zeta)) = 0.$$

Since $\pi_1(\zeta) = f\varphi$ for some function f, equation (8) tells us that f is harmonic. We have $f = O(r^\nu)$ on the ends and $\nu < 0$ (AC) or $\nu > 0$ (CS). Hence $f \to 0$ on the ends, and therefore the maximum principle forces $f = 0$. Now $\pi_7(\zeta) = *(X \wedge \varphi)$ for some 1-form X which by equation (9) is harmonic. But Proposition 3.6 says that there are no changes in the space of harmonic 1-forms in the interval $[-5, 0]$, so in fact we can say that $X = O(r^{-5})$, and then Corollary 2.8 says that $X = 0$. So in the AC case as well, equations (102) both hold. These two equations, together with the second equation of (99), when substituted into (101), yield $d^*\eta = d^* * (Q_\varphi(\eta))$. Now this expression together with the first equation of (99) gives equation (100).

Conversely, suppose that equation (100) holds. We thus have $d\eta = 0$, which is one of the three equations in (99), and we also have $d^*\eta = d^* * (Q_\varphi(\eta))$. Substituting this into equation (101) and taking the Hodge star, we obtain

$$d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi})) = \frac{7}{3} d * \pi_1(\zeta) + 2 d * \pi_7(\zeta). \tag{103}$$

Now we note that $\pi_1(\zeta) = f\varphi$ and $\pi_7(\zeta) = *(X \wedge \varphi)$ for some function f and some 1-form X. Therefore (103) can be written as

$$d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi})) = \frac{7}{3} df \wedge \psi + 2\, dX \wedge \varphi, \tag{104}$$

using the fact that φ is closed and coclosed. Now by the C^0-closeness assumption, we can apply Lemma 4.35 to (104) to conclude that all three terms of (103) vanish, provided we can show that $d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi})) = O(\varrho^{\lambda})$ and $X = O(\varrho^{\lambda+1})$ for some $\lambda < -\frac{7}{2}$ (AC) or $\lambda > -\frac{7}{2}$ (CS).

Since $\tilde{\varphi} - \varphi$ is $O(\varrho^{\nu})$, equation (16) and Lemma 2.7 give us that $d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi}))$ is $O(\varrho^{\nu-1}) + O(\varrho^{2\nu-1})$. But $\nu < 0$ in the AC case and $\nu > 0$ in the CS case, so in both cases the first term dominates on the ends, and thus $d(\Theta(\tilde{\varphi})) = O(\varrho^{\nu-1})$. Certainly in the CS case we have $\nu - 1 > -\frac{7}{2}$. In the AC case we need $\nu - 1 < -\frac{7}{2}$, that is $\nu < -\frac{5}{2}$, which is our hypothesis. Meanwhile $X \wedge \varphi = *\pi_7(\zeta)$ is $O(\varrho^{\nu})$, so $X = O(\varrho^{\nu})$ since $\varphi = O(1)$. (Recall it is the *difference* $\varphi - \varphi_C$ that is $O(\varrho^{\nu})$. The G_2 structure φ is $O(\varrho^0)$ because φ_C is.) Therefore $X = O(\varrho^{\lambda+1})$ for some $\lambda < -\frac{7}{2}$ (AC) or $\lambda > -\frac{7}{2}$ (CS) is equivalent to $\nu < -\frac{5}{2}$ (AC) or $\nu > -\frac{5}{2}$ (CS), which both hold. Thus we can indeed apply Lemma 4.35 to (104) to conclude that all three terms of (103) vanish.

All that remains to do in order to prove that (100) implies (99) is to show that $\pi_7(d^*\eta) = 0$, the gauge-fixing condition. Since κ is coclosed, this is equivalent to $\pi_7(d^*\zeta) = 0$. But we have just concluded that $\zeta = \pi_1(\zeta) + \pi_7(\zeta) + \pi_{27}(\zeta)$ with $\pi_1(\zeta) = f\varphi$ for some function f with $df = 0$ and $\pi_7(\zeta) = *(X \wedge \varphi)$ for some 1-form X such that $dX \wedge \varphi = 0$. From Definition 2.9, we see that $\operatorname{curl} X = 0$, so we can apply Lemma 2.18 to conclude that $\pi_7(d^*\zeta) = 0$, as required. □

Remark 5.15. The reader will have noticed that in the AC case, we needed the crucial hypothesis $\nu < -\frac{5}{2}$ for this theorem to be able to apply the various gauge-fixing results of Section 2.4. Without this assumption, we do not have a one-to-one correspondence. All we would know is that solutions to (99) give solutions to (100), but not conversely. Also, one direction in the proof of Theorem 5.14 did not require the assumption of C^0-closeness.

Corollary 5.16. *After possibly making $\varepsilon > 0$ smaller, the space $\mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon}_{l,\nu}$ is equal to the set of smooth forms η with $|\eta|_{C^0} < \varepsilon$ that satisfy equation* (100).

Proof. Since, for η sufficiently small, equation (100) is a nonlinear elliptic equation, its solutions are smooth [34, Theorem 6.8.1]. Therefore the claim follows by Theorem 5.14. □

5.2.4 Step 4: Applying the Banach space implicit function theorem

In this section we will apply the Banach space implicit function theorem to study the local structure of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\nu}$ of G_2 conifolds of rate ν.

We now proceed to formally define the *obstruction space* for our deformation problem. Recall from Theorem 5.8 that any 3-form η in $\Omega^3_{l,\nu}$ can be written uniquely as $\eta = \kappa + d\alpha + d^*\beta + \gamma$, where $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}^3_{\nu}$, and $\gamma \in W^3_{\nu}$. We also know that the space $W^3_{\nu} = \{0\}$ in the AC case when $\nu \in (-4, -\frac{5}{2})$. However, when W^3_{ν} is nonzero, there could be forms in W^3_{ν} that are either closed or coclosed, but not both, since otherwise they would be in $\mathcal{H}^3_{\nu}$ which is transverse to W^3_{ν}. We will need to split off such forms, if there are any, to define our obstruction space.

Definition 5.17. We define the *obstruction space* $\mathcal{O}_{\nu}$ for rate ν as follows:

- In the L^2 setting (when $\nu < -\frac{7}{2}$ for the AC case or for any $\nu > 0$ in the CS case), define $W^3_{\mathrm{c},\nu}$ to be the subspace of W^3_{ν} consisting of closed forms, and similarly let $W^3_{\mathrm{cc},\nu}$ be the subspace of coclosed forms. We have $W^3_{\mathrm{c},\nu} \cap W^3_{\mathrm{cc},\nu} = \{0\}$. Define $\mathcal{O}_\nu$ to be the L^2-orthogonal complement in W^3_ν of the subspace $W^3_{\mathrm{c},\nu} \oplus W^3_{\mathrm{cc},\nu}$. That is,

$$W^3_\nu \,=\, \big(W^3_{\mathrm{c},\nu} \oplus W^3_{\mathrm{cc},\nu}\big) \oplus \mathcal{O}_\nu. \tag{105}$$

The second $\oplus$ symbol above is an orthogonal direct sum, but in general the sum $W^3_{\mathrm{c},\nu} \oplus W^3_{\mathrm{cc},\nu}$ need not be orthogonal. Hence any $\gamma \in W^3_\nu$ can be written uniquely as $\gamma = \gamma_{\mathrm{c}} + \gamma_{\mathrm{cc}} + \gamma_o$ where $d\gamma_{\mathrm{c}} = 0$ and $d^*\gamma_{\mathrm{cc}} = 0$ and $\gamma_o \in \mathcal{O}_\nu$ is neither closed nor coclosed.

- In the AC case when $\nu \in (-4, -\frac{5}{2})$, we set $\mathcal{O}_\nu = \{0\}$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be the constant from Lemma 4.35 and Theorem 5.14. Let $\mathcal{U}$ denote the open subset of $\Omega^3_{l,\nu}$ consisting of 3-forms which are within ε of φ in the C^0 norm.

Lemma 5.18. *For $\eta \in \mathcal{U}$, we have $Q_\varphi(\eta) \in \Omega^4_{l,\nu}$, and so $d^* * (Q_\varphi(\eta)) \in \Omega^2_{l-1,\nu-1}$.*

Proof. This argument is very similar to [13, Proposition 6.4] and [28, Proposition 5.7], with some minor differences. We present it here for completeness. From Lemma 2.7 we have $Q_\varphi(0) = 0$ and $|Q_\varphi(\eta)| \leq C|\eta|^2$ for some positive constant C. That is, the smooth function Q_φ is the quadratic term in the second order polynomial for the smooth function Θ, as a function of $\eta \in \Lambda^3(T^*_x M)$, for fixed $x \in M$. More precisely, if we let $x^1, \ldots, x^7$ be local coordinates on M, and let $y^1, \ldots, y^{35}$ be local fibre coordinates for a trivialization of the bundle $\Lambda^3(T^*M)$, then we can regard Q_φ locally as a smooth function

$$R(x) \,=\, Q_\varphi(x, y(x))$$

such that, *for fixed* x and for $|y| \leq \varepsilon$, we have

$$(\nabla_x)^a (\partial_y)^b Q(x,y) \,=\, O(|y|^{\max(0,2-b)}). \tag{106}$$

We need to modify (106) by inserting the appropriate function of x as a multiplier for such an estimate to hold uniformly on M. Since φ is asymptotic to a G_2 cone at each end, it is clear that the appropriate uniform estimate is

$$|(\nabla_x)^a (\partial_y)^b Q(x,y)| \,\leq\, C\varrho^{-a} |y|^{\max(0,2-b)}, \qquad \forall a, b \geq 0, \tag{107}$$

where ϱ is a radius function on M. Since we always assume that $l \geq 6$, by Corollary 4.7 we have $\eta \in C^{2,\alpha}_\nu$, and thus in particular

$$|\eta| = O(\varrho^\nu) \qquad \text{and} \qquad |\nabla \eta| = O(\varrho^{\nu-1}). \tag{108}$$

Note that we know nothing about $|\nabla^k y|$ for $k > 2$. Now because $\nu < 0$ in the AC case with $\varrho \to \infty$ on the end, and likewise because $\nu > 0$ in the CS case with $\varrho \to 0$ on each end, in either case we find that ϱ^ν, and thus η, is *bounded* on M.

To prove that $Q_\varphi(\eta) \in \Omega^4_{l,\nu}$ we need to show that

$$\nabla^j R \,\in\, L^2_{0,\nu-j} \qquad \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq l.$$

By the chain rule, we have

$$|\nabla^j R| \,\leq\, C_j \sum_{\substack{a,b \geq 0 \\ a+b \leq j}} |(\nabla_x)^a (\partial y)^b R(x, y(x))| \cdot \left[\sum_{\substack{m_1, \ldots, m_b \geq 1 \\ a+m_1+\cdots+m_b = j}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{b} |\nabla^{m_i} y(x)| \right) \right] \tag{109}$$

for some positive constant C_j that is purely combinatorial and depends only on j. To show that $\nabla^j R$ is in $L^2_{0.\nu-j}$, we need to prove that the integral

$$\int_M |\varrho^{j-\nu}\,\nabla^j R|^2 \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M$$

is finite. From the inequality (109), it suffices to prove that each of the integrals

$$\int_M \varrho^{2j-2\nu} |(\nabla_x)^a (\partial y)^b R(x, y(x))|^2 \left(\prod_{i=1}^{b} |\nabla^{m_i} y(x)|^2 \right) \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M \tag{110}$$

is finite, where $a, b \geq 0$, $m_1, \ldots, m_b \geq 1$, $a + b \leq j$ and $a + m_1 + \cdots + m_b = j$.

Consider first the case $b = 0$. In this case, $a = j$ and the product is empty. Hence, from (107) and the fact that $|y| = |\eta|$ is bounded on M, we have $|(\nabla_x)^j R| \leq C \varrho^{-j} |y|^2 \leq C \varrho^{-j} |y|$. Hence the integral in (110) is bounded above by

$$C \int_M \varrho^{2j-2\nu} \varrho^{-2j} |\eta|^2 \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M = C \int_M \varrho^{-2\nu} |\eta|^2 \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M$$

which is finite since $\eta \in L^2_{l,\nu} \subseteq L^2_{0,\nu}$.

Next we consider the case $b = 1$. This time, $m_1 \geq 1$ and $a + m_1 = j$. Thus, from (107) and (108), we have $|(\nabla_x)^a (\partial_y) R| \leq C \varrho^{-a} |y| \leq C \varrho^{-a+\nu}$. Hence the integral in (110) is bounded above by

$$C \int_M \varrho^{2j-2\nu} \varrho^{-2a+2\nu} |\nabla^{m_1} \eta|^2 \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M = C \int_M \varrho^{2m_1} |\nabla^{m_1} \eta|^2 \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M. \tag{111}$$

However, since $\eta \in L^2_{l,\nu}$, we have $\nabla^{m_1} \eta \in L^2_{l-m_1,\nu-m_1} \subseteq L^2_{0,\nu-m_1}$ and therefore the integral

$$\int_M \varrho^{-2\nu+2m_1} |\nabla^{m_1} \eta|^2 \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M \tag{112}$$

is finite. But in either the AC case or the CS case, the function $\varrho^{-2\nu} \to \infty$ at the ends, so outside of a compact set the integrand of (112) dominates the integrand of (111). Hence the integrals in (110) with $b = 1$ are indeed finite.

Finally we consider the general case of $b \geq 2$. Now from (107) we have $|(\nabla_x)^a (\partial_y)^b R| \leq C \varrho^{-a}$. Hence the integral in (110) is bounded above by

$$C \int_M \varrho^{2j-2\nu} \varrho^{-2a} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{b} |\nabla^{m_i} \eta|^2 \right) \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M. \tag{113}$$

For $i = 1, \ldots, b$, define $q_i = \frac{j-a}{m_i}$. Since $b \geq 2$ and $a + m_1 + \cdots + m_b = j$, we have $q_i > 1$, and also $\sum_{i=1}^{b} \frac{1}{q_i} = 1$. Observe also that the integrand of (113) can be written as $\prod_{i=1}^{b} s_i$, where

$$s_i \;=\; \varrho^{2m_i - \frac{2\nu}{q_i}} |\nabla^{m_i} \eta|^2 \varrho^{-\frac{7}{q_i}}.$$

Now by Hölder's inequality, we have $\int_M (\prod_{i=1}^{b} s_i) \mathsf{vol}_M = || \prod_{i=1}^{b} s_i ||_1 \leq \prod_{i=1}^{b} ||s_i||_{q_i}$. Thus we can finish the proof if we can show the finiteness of the integrals

$$||s_i||_{q_i}^{q_i} \;=\; \int_M s_i^{q_i} \mathsf{vol}_M \;=\; \int_M \varrho^{2m_i q_i - 2\nu} |\nabla^{m_i} \eta|^{2q_i} \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M. \tag{114}$$

We claim that the above integral is indeed finite, by the Sobolev embedding Theorem 4.6. To see this, let $p = 2$, and let $q = 2q_i > 2$ since $q_i > 1$. Let $m = m_i$. We have $l \geq m$ since $m_i \leq j \leq l$. Furthermore, the last remaining inequality we need to use the embedding theorem is

$$l - \frac{7}{2} \geq m - \frac{7}{q} = m_i - \frac{7}{2q_i} = m_i \left(1 - \frac{7}{2(j-a)} \right),$$

which is easy to verify from $2 \leq j - a \leq l$ and $0 < \frac{m_i}{l} \leq 1$. Thus Theorem 4.6 tells us that $L^2_{l,\nu} \subseteq L^{2q_i}_{m_i,\nu}$, and therefore

$$\int_M \varrho^{2m_i q_i - 2\nu q_i} |\nabla^{m_i} \eta|^{2q_i} \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M = \int_M \varrho^{2\nu(1-q_i)} \varrho^{2m_i q_i - 2\nu} |\nabla^{m_i} \eta|^{2q_i} \varrho^{-7} \mathsf{vol}_M \tag{115}$$

is finite. But now, just as in the $b = 1$ case, since $q_i > 1$, the integrand of (115) dominates the integrand of (114) outside of a compact set, and hence the proof is complete. □

Now we define a *nonlinear map*

$$F : \mathcal{U} \subseteq \Omega^3_{l,\nu} \to \Omega^2_{l-1,\nu-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\nu-1}$$

by the rule

$$F(\eta) = (d + d^*)(\eta) - d^* * (Q_\varphi(\eta)). \tag{116}$$

Note that this map is well defined by Lemma 5.18. The motivation for this definition is that, by Theorem 5.14, the zero set of F is precisely the space $\mathcal{R}^\varepsilon_{l,\nu}$ which by Theorem 5.13 is homemorphic to the space $\mathcal{T}_\nu$ of nearby torsion-free G_2 structures on M that are asymptotic on the ends to the same G_2 cones as φ_M, modulo the appropriate notion of equivalence, as defined in Section 5.1.

Lemma 5.19. *The linearization $DF|_0$ of F at the origin is the map*

$$\begin{aligned} DF|_0 : \Omega^3_{l,\nu} &\to \Omega^\bullet_{l-1,\nu-1} \\ \dot\eta &\mapsto (d + d^*)(\dot\eta). \end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

Proof. This follows immediately from the definition of Q_φ as the quadratic approximation of the nonlinear map Θ in Lemma 2.7. □

From Lemma 5.19, we see that $DF|_0$ always maps onto the space

$$\mathcal{Y}_0 = (d + d^*)(\Omega^3_{l,\nu}), \tag{118}$$

which is the image of $d + d^*$ acting on just the 3-forms. In order to be able to apply the Banach space implicit function theorem to F, we need to know that F maps into $\mathcal{Y}_0$ and that $\mathcal{Y}_0$ is a Banach space. If we could show this, we could redefine the codomain of the map F to be $\mathcal{Y}_0$. Surjectivity will then be immediate and we will be able to apply the Banach space implicit function Theorem 1.1. However, the problem is that $d^*(\Omega^3_{l,\nu})$ is in general not contained in $(d + d^*)(\Omega^3_{l,\nu})$, so the nonlinear term in (116) does not actually lie in $\mathcal{Y}_0$. However, we will show below that $d^*(\Omega^3_{l,\nu}) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}_0 \oplus d(\mathcal{O}_\nu)$. Thus, we need to "correct" the map F to a map

$$\widehat{F} : \mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{O}_\nu \to \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_0 + d(\mathcal{O}_\nu) \tag{119}$$

by the rule

$$\widehat{F}(\eta, \xi) = (d + d^*)(\eta) - d^* * (Q_\varphi(\eta)) + d\xi. \tag{120}$$

Lemma 5.20. *The sum $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_0 + d(\mathcal{O}_\nu)$ is a direct sum. In fact, we have that*

$$\mathcal{Y} \;=\; \mathcal{Y}_0 \oplus d(\mathcal{O}_\nu) \;=\; (d+d^*)(\Omega^3_{l,\nu}) \oplus d(\mathcal{O}_\nu) \;=\; d(\Omega^3_{l,\nu}) + d^*(\Omega^3_{l,\nu}), \tag{121}$$

where the last sum is an orthogonal direct sum in the L^2-setting.

Proof. First, we prove that $\mathcal{Y}_0 \cap d(\mathcal{O}_\nu) = \{0\}$. Clearly the statement is vacuously true in the non-L^2 setting, when $\mathcal{O}_\nu = \{0\}$. So consider the L^2 setting, and suppose that $\eta \in \Omega^3_{l,\nu}$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}_\nu$, with $(d+d^*)\eta = d\gamma$. Comparing degrees, we have $d^*\eta = 0$ and $d(\eta - \gamma) = 0$. Since $\eta - \gamma$ is closed, it is L^2-orthogonal to the image of d^*, and thus by Theorem 5.8 we can write $\eta - \gamma = \kappa' + d\alpha' + \gamma'$ where $\kappa' \in \mathcal{H}^3_\nu$ and $\gamma' \in W^3_\nu$. But then $d(\eta - \gamma) = 0$ implies that $d\gamma' = 0$. Since we also know that η is coclosed, it is L^2-orthogonal to the image of d, and thus in the expression $\eta = \kappa' + d\alpha' + \gamma' + \gamma$ we must have $d\alpha' = 0$. The condition $d^*\eta = 0$ then gives $d^*(\gamma' + \gamma) = 0$. In the notation of Definition 5.17, we have shown that $\gamma' \in W^3_{\mathrm{c},\nu}$ and $\gamma'' = \gamma' + \gamma \in W^3_{\mathrm{cc},\nu}$, where $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}_\nu$. Thus $\gamma' - \gamma'' + \gamma = 0$. But the directness of the sums in (105) now forces $\gamma = 0$. Thus we have shown that $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_0 \oplus d(\mathcal{O}_\nu)$.

For the second statement, it is clear that $(d+d^*)(\Omega^3_\nu) \oplus d(\mathcal{O}_\nu) \subseteq d(\Omega^3_\nu) + d^*(\Omega^3_\nu)$, so we need only show the reverse inclusion. Let $\sigma, \tau \in \Omega^3_\nu$. Applying the Hodge decomposition of Theorem 5.8 to $\tau - \sigma$, we can write $\tau - \sigma = \kappa + d\alpha + d^*\beta + \gamma$ where in particular $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}^3_\nu$ and γ in W^3_ν. But then we find that

$$\begin{aligned} d\sigma + d^*\tau \;&=\; (d+d^*)(\sigma) + d^*(\tau - \sigma) \\ &=\; (d+d^*)(\sigma) + d^*(d\alpha + d^*\beta + \kappa + \gamma) \\ &=\; (d+d^*)(\sigma) + d^*(d\alpha + \gamma). \end{aligned}$$

By (105) we can write $\gamma = \gamma_{\mathrm{c}} + \gamma_{\mathrm{cc}} + \gamma_o$ for some *closed* form γ_{c}, some *coclosed* form γ_{cc}, and some form $\gamma_o \in \mathcal{O}_\nu$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\sigma + d^*\tau \;&=\; (d+d^*)(\sigma) + d^*(d\alpha + \gamma_{\mathrm{c}} + \gamma_o) \\ &=\; (d+d^*)(\sigma + d\alpha + \gamma_{\mathrm{c}} + \gamma_o) + d(-\gamma_o) \\ &\in\; (d+d^*)(\Omega^3_\nu) + d(\mathcal{O}_\nu) \end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted to show. □

Remark 5.21. Recall from Definition 5.17 that d is injective on $\mathcal{O}_\nu$. Hence, Lemma 5.20 says that the dimension of $\mathcal{O}_\nu$ is precisely equal to the dimension of the quotient space

$$\left[d(\Omega^3_{l,\nu}) + d^*(\Omega^3_{l,\nu})\right] \,/\, (d+d^*)(\Omega^3_{l,\nu}). \tag{122}$$

Lemma 5.22. *For generic rates ν, the space $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_0 \oplus d(\mathcal{O}_\nu)$ is a Banach space, and the map $\widehat{F}$ defined in equation* (120) *actually maps into this space.*

Proof. If we assume that $\nu + 1$ is noncritical for $d + d^*$, the map

$$(d+d^*)_{l+1,\nu+1} : \Omega^\bullet_{l+1,\nu+1} \to \Omega^\bullet_{l,\nu}$$

is Fredholm, and thus has closed image. In fact, the Lockhart–McOwen theory [22, Section 2] says that at a noncritical rate, for any $\eta \in \Omega^3_{l,\nu}$ that is orthogonal (with respect to the $L^2_{l,\nu}$ inner product) to the kernel of $d + d^*$, we have the estimate

$$||\eta||_{L^2_{l,\nu}} \;\le\; C||(d+d^*)(\eta)||_{L^2_{l-1,\nu-1}}. \tag{123}$$

But from this estimate, it is a standard result [1, Corollary 2.15] that $\mathcal{Y}_0 = (d+d^*)(\Omega^3_{l,\nu})$ is a *closed* subspace of $\Omega^\bullet_{l-1,\nu-1}$, and thus a Banach space. Since $\mathcal{O}_\nu$ is finite-dimensional, so is $d(\mathcal{O}_\nu)$ and thus $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_0 \oplus d(\mathcal{O}_\nu)$ is a Banach space.

By the definition of $\mathcal{Y} = (d+d^*)(\Omega^3_\nu) + d(\mathcal{O}_\nu)$, to show that the map $\widehat{F}$ of equation (120) maps into $\mathcal{Y}$, we need only show that $d^* * (Q_\varphi(\eta))$ lies in $\mathcal{Y}$. We note by Lemma 5.18 that the 3-form $\chi = *(Q_\varphi(\eta))$ lies in $\Omega^3_{l,\nu}$. The result is now immediate by Lemma 5.20. $\square$

Corollary 5.23. *The linearization $D\widehat{F}|_0$ of $\widehat{F}$ at the origin is the map*

$$\begin{aligned} D\widehat{F}|_0 &: \Omega^3_{l,\nu} \oplus \mathcal{O}_\nu \to \mathcal{Y} \\ &: (\dot{\eta}, \dot{\xi}) \mapsto (d+d^*)(\dot{\eta}) + d\dot{\xi}. \end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

and $D\widehat{F}|_0$ is surjective *onto $\mathcal{Y}$.*

Proof. The first statement follows from Lemma 5.19 and equation (120), while the second statement is immediate from the definition of $\mathcal{Y}$ in Lemma 5.22. $\square$

Consider the Banach space $\mathcal{X} = \Omega^3_{l,\nu} \oplus \mathcal{O}_\nu$. For generic rates ν, we have shown that the differential $D\widehat{F}|_0$ maps surjectively from $\mathcal{X}$ onto $\mathcal{Y}$. It is also clear that $\widehat{F}$ is a C^∞ map from $\widehat{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O}_\nu$ to $\mathcal{Y}$. Finally, note from Corollary 5.23 and the proof of Lemma 5.20 that

$$\mathcal{K} \;=\; \ker D\widehat{F}|_0 \;=\; \ker DF|_0 \oplus \{0\} \;=\; \mathcal{H}^3_\nu, \tag{125}$$

and we have $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{K} \oplus \mathcal{Z}$ for a closed subspace $\mathcal{Z}$ by Propositions 5.3 and 5.6. Thus, we can apply Theorem 1.1 to conclude that there exist open sets $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$, both containing 0, with $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{O}_\nu$, and a C^∞-map $G : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{W}$ such that

$$\widehat{F}^{-1}(0) \cap (\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W}) \;=\; \{(x, G(x));\, x \in \mathcal{V}\}$$

in $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{K} \oplus \mathcal{Z}$. We have therefore established the following result.

Corollary 5.24. *The set $\widehat{F}^{-1}(0)$ is a smooth manifold, diffeomorphic to an open neighbourhood $\mathcal{V}$ of the origin in $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H}^3_\nu$, and hence with dimension $\dim \widehat{F}^{-1}(0) = \dim \mathcal{H}^3_\nu$.*

Notice that $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_0 \oplus \mathcal{O}_\nu$ for some closed subspace $\mathcal{Z}_0$ of $\Omega^3_{l,\nu}$. Thus the projection map $\pi_o : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{O}_\nu$ is well defined and smooth. It is also clear that $F^{-1}(0)$ can be identified homeomorphically with the subset $\pi_o^{-1}(0)$ of $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{H}^3_\nu$. Hence we have shown the following.

Corollary 5.25. *The composition $\Psi_\nu = \pi_o \circ G$ is a smooth map*

$$\Psi_\nu \,:\, \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{O}_\nu$$

from the open subset $\mathcal{V}$ of the finite-dimensional vector space $\mathcal{H}^3_\nu$ to the finite-dimensional vector space $\mathcal{O}_\nu$, whose zero set $\Psi_\nu^{-1}(0)$ is homeomorphic to $F^{-1}(0)$.

By combining Corollary 5.25 with Theorems 5.13 and 5.14 we have the following result.

Theorem 5.26. *The moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is locally homeomorphic to the zero set $\Psi_\nu^{-1}(0)$ of a smooth map Ψ_ν from an open subset $\mathcal{V}$ of a finite-dimensional vector space $\mathcal{H}^3_\nu$ to a finite-dimensional vector space $\mathcal{O}_\nu$. In particular, in the AC case when $\nu \in (-4, -\frac{5}{2})$, we have $\mathcal{O}_\nu = \{0\}$, and thus in this case, $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is a smooth manifold of dimension $\dim \mathcal{H}^3_\nu$.*

Remark 5.27. We could conclude that $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is a smooth manifold if we knew that the map Ψ_ν was the zero map. However, this will not be true in general.

5.2.5 Step 5: Computing the virtual dimension of the moduli space

In this section we compute the expected (virtual) dimension of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\nu$, including an exact result for the dimension of the moduli space in the unobstructed case. Explicitly, the integer $\text{v-dim}\,\mathcal{M}_\nu$ would be the dimension of $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ if it were a smooth manifold. From Corollary 5.25, this virtual dimension is

$$\text{v-dim}\,\mathcal{M}_\nu \;=\; \dim \mathcal{H}^3_\nu - \dim \mathcal{O}_\nu. \tag{126}$$

From Lemma 5.20 and Remark 5.21, this virtual dimension is precisely the *index* of the map

$$\mathfrak{D}_{l,\nu} = (d+d^*)_{l,\nu} : \Omega^3_{l,\nu} \to \mathcal{Y} = d(\Omega^3_{l,\nu}) + d^*(\Omega^3_{l,\nu}). \tag{127}$$

For simplicity we will often use the symbol $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\nu}$ to denote this map, which is just $(d+d^*)_{l,\nu}$ with domain restricted to Ω^3_ν and codomain restricted to $\mathcal{Y}$. Thus, we have

$$\text{v-dim}\,\mathcal{M}_\nu \;=\; \operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,\nu}). \tag{128}$$

In order to compute $\text{v-dim}\,\mathcal{M}_\nu$, we need to prove a refined version of the "index-change" formula of Theorem 4.21 for the operator $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\nu}$ defined in (127). Note that Theorem 4.21 *does not* directly apply to this operator $\mathfrak{D}$, since although (for generic rates ν) it is Fredholm, it is clearly *not* elliptic.

Definition 5.28. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be an n-tuple of rates, with $n = 1$ in the AC case as usual. Suppose there exists a nontrivial *closed and coclosed* 3-form υ_i on the cone C_i, homogeneous of order λ_i for some $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Then we say λ is a *critical rate* for the operator

$$\mathfrak{D} = d + d^* : \Omega^3_{l,\lambda} \to d(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda}) + d^*(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda})$$

on the conifold M. The critical rates for $\mathfrak{D}$ are thus a subset of the critical rates for the operator $d+d^* : \Omega^\bullet_{l,\lambda} \to \Omega^\bullet_{l-1,\lambda-1}$. From Lemma 3.8, we know that there are no $\log(r)$ terms for the operator $d+d^*$ on the cone, so we can use the notation of Definition 4.20 to define the space $\mathcal{K}(\lambda_i)_{\mathfrak{D}_{C_i}}$ to be *exactly* the space of such forms υ_i. That is,

$$\mathcal{K}(\lambda_i)_{\mathfrak{D}_{C_i}} \;=\; \left\{\gamma \in \Gamma(\Lambda^3(T^*C_i));\, d\gamma = 0,\, d^*_{C_i}\gamma = 0,\, \gamma \text{ is homogeneous of order } \lambda_i\right\}. \tag{129}$$

The next lemma shows that elements in the space $\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{\mathfrak{D}_{C_i}}$ correspond to solutions to a certain system of eigenvalue equations on the link Σ_i of the cone C_i.

Lemma 5.29. *Let $\gamma = r^\lambda(r^2 dr \wedge \alpha_2 + r^3\alpha_3)$ be a 3-form on the cone C, homogeneous of order λ, where α_k is a k-form on the link Σ. Then $(d + d^*_C)(\gamma) = 0$ if and only if*

$$\begin{aligned} d_\Sigma\alpha_2 &= (\lambda+3)\alpha_3, & d_\Sigma\alpha_3 &= 0, \\ d^*_\Sigma\alpha_2 &= 0, & d^*_\Sigma\alpha_3 &= (\lambda+4)\alpha_2. \end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

Proof. This is immediate from (32). □

The next proposition establishes that generically, $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ is Fredholm, and it gives a characterization of the cokernel of $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$, which is essentially exactly the obstruction space.

Proposition 5.30. *Let λ be a* noncritical rate *for $d + d^*$ on M.*

(a) The map

$$\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda} \;:\; \Omega^3_{l,\lambda} \to d(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda}) + d^*(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda})$$

is Fredholm. Furthermore, $\ker \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ *is a subspace of* $\ker(d+d^*)_{l,\lambda}$*, and* $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ *is a subspace of* $\operatorname{coker}(d+d^*)_{l,\lambda}$*, in the following sense: there exists a particular topological complement of* $\operatorname{im}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda})$ *in* $d(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda}) + d^*(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda})$ *(and thus isomorphic to* $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$*) that is a subspace of the orthogonal complement of* $\operatorname{im}(d+d^*)_{l,\lambda}$*, with respect to the Hilbert space inner product on* $\Omega^{\bullet}_{l-1,\lambda-1}$*.*

(b) The space $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ *is isomorphic to the* quotient *of the space* $\ker(d+d^*)_{-6-\lambda} \cap (\Omega^2 \oplus \Omega^4)$ *of closed and coclosed forms of degree* $2+4$ *of rate* $-6-\lambda$ *by the subspace* $\mathcal{H}^2_{-6-\lambda} \oplus \mathcal{H}^4_{-6-\lambda}$ *of closed and coclosed* 2*-forms plus closed and coclosed* 4*-forms of rate* $-6-\lambda$*.*

Proof. For any λ, we have $\ker \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda} = \mathcal{H}^3_\lambda$ is finite-dimensional. We showed in Lemma 5.20 that $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ has finite-dimensional cokernel. Finally, if λ is not critical for $d+d^*$ on M, then we proved in Lemma 5.22 that $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ has closed image. Thus $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ is Fredholm. Next, we will prove the statements about the kernel and cokernel of $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$. The arguments are identical in the CS case (except for the fact that we have n ends instead of just one, and the inequalities are reversed) so we prove just the AC case.

It is clear from the definition of $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ that $\ker \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ is a subspace of $\ker(d+d^*)_{l,\lambda}$. We need to establish the analogous result for $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$. To simplify notation, in this proof only, we will use E to denote the subspace $(d+d^*)(\Omega^{\bullet}_{l,\lambda})$ of $\Omega^{\bullet}_{l-1,\lambda-1}$, which is *closed* if λ is noncritical for $d+d^*$. Also, let F denote the orthogonal complement of E with respect to the Hilbert space inner product on $\Omega^{\bullet}_{l,\lambda}$. Thus we have

$$\Omega^{\bullet}_{l-1,\lambda-1} \;=\; (d+d^*)(\Omega^{\bullet}_{l,\lambda}) \oplus \operatorname{coker}(d+d^*)_{l,\lambda} \;=\; E \oplus F$$

where in fact by Remark 4.16 we know that

$$F \;\cong\; \operatorname{Ann}(E) \;=\; \ker(d+d^*)_{-6-\lambda} \tag{131}$$

where $\operatorname{Ann}(E)$ denotes the annihilator of E in the dual space.

Now consider the orthogonal projection P^{2+4} of E onto the closed subspace $\Omega^2_{l-1,\lambda-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\lambda-1}$. We have that

$$P^{2+4}(E) \;=\; d(\Omega^1_{l,\lambda}) + (d+d^*)(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda}) + d^*(\Omega^5_{l,\lambda}) \;=\; E'$$

is closed in the Hilbert space $\Omega^2_{l-1,\lambda-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\lambda-1}$. Thus we can write

$$\Omega^2_{l-1,\lambda-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\lambda-1} \;=\; E' \oplus F'$$

where we take F' to be the orthogonal complement of E' with respect to the Hilbert space inner product on $\Omega^2_{l-1,\lambda-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\lambda-1}$. By Remark 4.16 we have

$$F' \;\cong\; \operatorname{Ann}(E'). \tag{132}$$

It is trivial to compute that

$$\operatorname{Ann}(E') \;=\; \ker(d+d^*)_{-6-\lambda} \cap (\Omega^2 \oplus \Omega^4). \tag{133}$$

That is, F' is isomorphic to the space of closed and coclosed forms of degree $2+4$ of rate $-6-\lambda$.

From Lemma 5.20 and Lemma 5.22 we have that

$$d(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda}) + d^*(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda}) \;=\; (d+d^*)(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda}) \oplus d(\mathcal{O}_\lambda)$$

is closed in $\Omega^2_{l-1,\lambda-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\lambda-1}$, and $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda} \cong d(\mathcal{O}_\lambda)$. Note that $d(\mathcal{O}_\lambda)$ is a subspace of 4-forms, and is thus always transverse to $d(\Omega^1_{l,\lambda})$. In addition, it is transverse to $d^*(\Omega^5_{l,\lambda})$, because in the L^2 setting the images of d and d^* are orthogonal, and in the non-L^2 setting we know that $d(\mathcal{O}_\lambda) = \{0\}$. These observations tell us that we can also write

$$\Omega^2_{l-1,\lambda-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\lambda-1} \;=\; E'' \oplus F''$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E'' \;&=\; d(\Omega^1_{l,\lambda}) + d(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda}) + d^*(\Omega^3_{l,\lambda}) + d^*(\Omega^5_{l,\lambda}) \\ &=\; E' \oplus d(\mathcal{O}_\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

and F'' is the orthogonal complement of E'' with respect to the Hilbert space inner product on $\Omega^2_{l-1,\lambda-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\lambda-1}$. We therefore clearly have

$$F' = d(\mathcal{O}_\lambda) \oplus F'' \tag{134}$$

and we note again that by Remark 4.16 we have

$$F'' \;\cong\; \operatorname{Ann}(E''). \tag{135}$$

In this case it is easy to see that

$$\operatorname{Ann}(E'') \;=\; \mathcal{H}^2_{-6-\lambda} \oplus \mathcal{H}^4_{-6-\lambda}. \tag{136}$$

We pause here to note that equations (132), (133), (134), (135), and (136) together imply part (b) of the proposition.

Now we have that $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda} \cong d(\mathcal{O}_\lambda)$, which is a subspace of F'. But we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F' \;&=\; \{\gamma \in \Omega^2_{l-1,\lambda-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\lambda-1};\, \langle\langle P^{2+4}(\alpha), \gamma\rangle\rangle_{\Omega^\bullet_{l-1,\lambda-1}} = 0,\, \forall \alpha \in E\} \\ &=\; \{\gamma \in \Omega^2_{l-1,\lambda-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\lambda-1};\, \langle\langle \alpha, \gamma\rangle\rangle_{\Omega^\bullet_{l-1,\lambda-1}} = 0,\, \forall \alpha \in E\} \\ &=\; \{\gamma \in \Omega^\bullet_{l-1,\lambda-1};\, \langle\langle \alpha, \gamma\rangle\rangle_{\Omega^\bullet_{l-1,\lambda-1}} = 0,\, \forall \alpha \in E\} \cap \big(\Omega^2_{l-1,\lambda-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\lambda-1}\big) \\ &=\; F \cap \big(\Omega^2_{l-1,\lambda-1} \oplus \Omega^4_{l-1,\lambda-1}\big) \\ &\subseteq F \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. □

Remark 5.31. By Proposition 4.18, the quotient of $\ker(d + d^*)_{-6-\lambda} \cap (\Omega^2 \oplus \Omega^4)$ by the subspace $\mathcal{H}^2_{-6-\lambda} \oplus \mathcal{H}^4_{-6-\lambda}$ (and thus $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$) will be zero when $-6-\lambda < -\frac{5}{2}$ in the AC case. This reconfirms the fact that $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda} = d(\mathcal{O}_\lambda)$ is zero in the non-L^2 setting of the AC case, corresponding to $\lambda > -\frac{7}{2}$.

We pause here to state and prove a result about homogeneous forms on a cone, Theorem 5.33, which relates closed and coclosed 3-forms on C, homogeneous of degree λ, to a particular subspace of forms on the cone C of degree $2 + 4$, homogeneous of degree $-6 - \lambda$, in the kernel of $d + d^*$. This result will be used in Theorem 5.35 to establish an index change formula for $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$. Before we can state the theorem, we need to define several spaces.

Consider a form γ of degree $2+4$ on the cone, homogeneous of order $-6-\lambda$. Using Definition 3.2 we can write

$$\gamma \;=\; r^{-6-\lambda}(rdr\wedge\beta_1 + r^2\beta_2 + r^3 dr\wedge\beta_3 + r^4\beta_4) \tag{137}$$

where each β_k is a k-form. We will sometimes write this form as a 4-tuple $(\beta_1,\beta_2,\beta_3,\beta_4)$. From the equations (32), it follows easily that γ is in the kernel of $d+d^*$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} d^*\beta_1 &= 0, & d^*\beta_2 &= -(\lambda+1)\beta_1,\\ d\beta_3 &= -(\lambda+2)\beta_4, & d\beta_4 &= 0,\\ d\beta_1 + d^*\beta_3 &= -(\lambda+4)\beta_2, & d\beta_2 + d^*\beta_4 &= -(\lambda+3)\beta_3. \end{aligned} \tag{138}$$

We will denote by $A(\lambda)$ the space of solutions to the system of equations (138). Let $B(\lambda)$ denote the subspace of $A(\lambda)$ consisting of forms γ of degree $2+4$, homogeneous of order $-6-\lambda$, such that each pure degree component $\gamma_2 = r^{-6-\lambda}(rdr\wedge\beta_1 + r^2\beta_2)$ and $\gamma_4 = r^{-6-\lambda}(r^3dr\wedge\beta_3 + r^4\beta_4)$ is independently closed and coclosed. Again using equations (32), we find that γ is in $B(\lambda)$ if and only if, in addition to equations (138), we also have

$$d\beta_2 = 0, \qquad d^*\beta_3 = 0. \tag{139}$$

Finally, define $C(\lambda)$ to be the subspace of $A(\lambda)$ consisting of forms of the type (137) with $\beta_1 = 0$ and $\beta_4 = 0$. That is, γ lies in $C(\lambda)$ if and only if $\gamma = r^{-6-\lambda}(r^2\beta_2 + r^3dr\wedge\beta_3)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} d^*\beta_2 &= 0, & d\beta_3 &= 0,\\ d^*\beta_3 &= -(\lambda+4)\beta_2, & d\beta_2 &= -(\lambda+3)\beta_3. \end{aligned} \tag{140}$$

Remark 5.32. From Lemma 5.29, we note that $(0,\beta_2,\beta_3,0)\in C(\lambda)$ if and only if there exists a closed and coclosed 3-form on the cone, homogeneous *of order* λ, given by $r^\lambda(r^2dr\wedge\beta_2 - r^3\beta_3)$. That is, the space $C(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to the space of closed and coclosed 3-forms on the cone, homogeneous of order λ.

Theorem 5.33. *We have $C(-3)\subseteq B(-3)$ and $C(-4)\subseteq B(-4)$. Furthermore, if $\lambda\neq -3$ and $\lambda\neq -4$, then $A(\lambda) = B(\lambda)\oplus C(\lambda)$, where the direct sum is orthogonal with respect to the L^2 inner product on forms on Σ. That is, for $\lambda\notin\{-3,-4\}$, the subspace of forms on the cone of degree $2+4$, homogeneous of degree $-6-\lambda$, in the kernel of $d+d^*$, and L^2-orthogonal to those forms which are independently closed and coclosed, is* isomorphic *to the space of closed and coclosed* 3*-forms, homogeneous of order λ.*

Proof. Suppose $\lambda = -3$, and that $(0,\beta_2,\beta_3,0)\in C(-3)$. Then equations (140) say that β_2 is a closed and coclosed (thus harmonic) 2-form on Σ, which is also coexact. By Hodge theory, we get $\beta_2 = 0$ and hence β_3 is a harmonic 3-form on Σ. But then $(0,0,\beta_3,0)$ satisfies the equations (138) and (139), and thus lies in $B(-3)$. The proof of $C(-4)\subseteq B(-4)$ is similar.

Next we show that if $\lambda\notin\{-3,-4\}$, then the subspaces $B(\lambda)$ and $C(\lambda)$ are L^2-orthogonal. Suppose $(\beta_1,\beta_2,\beta_3,\beta_4)\in B(\lambda)$ and $(\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\gamma_3,\gamma_4)\in C(\lambda)$. Then we have $\gamma_1 = 0$ and $\gamma_4 = 0$, and using equations (138) and (139) for $(\beta_1,\beta_2,\beta_3,\beta_4)$, and equations (140) for $(0,\gamma_2,\gamma_3,0)$ we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \beta_2,\gamma_2\rangle\rangle \;&=\; \langle\langle -(\lambda+4)^{-1}(d\beta_1 + d^*\beta_3), -(\lambda+4)^{-1}d^*\gamma_3\rangle\rangle \\ &=\; (\lambda+4)^{-2}\langle\langle d\beta_1, d^*\gamma_3\rangle\rangle \;=\; 0 \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\langle \beta_3, \gamma_3\rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle -(\lambda+3)^{-1}(d\beta_2 + d^*\beta_4), -(\lambda+3)^{-1}d\gamma_2\rangle\rangle \\ &= (\lambda+3)^{-2}\langle\langle d^*\beta_4, d\gamma_2\rangle\rangle = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we indeed have $B(\lambda) \perp C(\lambda)$.

Finally, we will complete the proof by showing that if $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4) \in A(\lambda)$ is L^2-orthogonal to $B(\lambda)$, then it is in $C(\lambda)$. This would imply that $A(\lambda) = B(\lambda) \oplus C(\lambda)$, as claimed. Define $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_1 &= \beta_1, & \gamma_2 &= -(\lambda+4)^{-1}d\beta_1, \\ \gamma_3 &= -(\lambda+3)^{-1}d^*\beta_4, & \gamma_4 &= \beta_4.\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4)$ satisfies equations (138), it is easy to check that $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4)$ satisfies equations (138) and (139), so $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4)$ lies in $B(\lambda)$. Our hypothesis is that $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4)$ is L^2-orthogonal to the space $B(\lambda)$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\langle \beta_1, \gamma_1\rangle\rangle &= ||\beta_1||^2, \\ \langle\langle \beta_2, \gamma_2\rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle \beta_2, -(\lambda+4)^{-1}d\beta_1\rangle\rangle = -(\lambda+4)^{-1}\langle\langle d^*\beta_2, \beta_1\rangle\rangle \\ &= -(\lambda+4)^{-1}\langle\langle -(\lambda+1)\beta_1, \beta_1\rangle\rangle = \frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda+4}\,||\beta_1||^2, \\ \langle\langle \beta_3, \gamma_3\rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle \beta_3, -(\lambda+3)^{-1}d^*\beta_4\rangle\rangle = -(\lambda+3)^{-1}\langle\langle d\beta_3, \beta_4\rangle\rangle \\ &= -(\lambda+3)^{-1}\langle\langle -(\lambda+2)\beta_4, \beta_4\rangle\rangle = \frac{\lambda+2}{\lambda+3}\,||\beta_4||^2, \\ \langle\langle \beta_4, \gamma_4\rangle\rangle &= ||\beta_4||^2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, since $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4)$ is L^2-orthogonal to $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4)$, we find that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{4}\langle\langle \beta_k, \gamma_k\rangle\rangle = \left(1 + \frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda+4}\right)||\beta_1||^2 + \left(1 + \frac{\lambda+2}{\lambda+3}\right)||\beta_4||^2 = 0. \tag{141}$$

We have $\Delta\beta_1 = dd^*\beta_1 + d^*d\beta_1 = -(\lambda+4)d^*\beta_2 = (\lambda+1)(\lambda+4)\beta_1$. Thus by the nonnegativity of the Hodge Laplacian, we have $\beta_1 = 0$ if $\lambda \in (-4, -1)$. But if $\lambda \notin [-4, -1)$ then $1 + \frac{\lambda+1}{\lambda+4} > 0$. Similarly we observe that $\Delta\beta_4 = dd^*\beta_4 + d^*d\beta_4 = -(\lambda+3)d\beta_3 = (\lambda+3)(\lambda+2)\beta_4$. Thus we have $\beta_4 = 0$ if $\lambda \in (-3, -2)$. But if $\lambda \notin [-3, -2)$ then $1 + \frac{\lambda+2}{\lambda+3} > 0$. Thus we conclude that in all cases when $\lambda \neq -3$ and $\lambda \neq -4$, equation (141) tells us that $\beta_1 = 0$ and $\beta_4 = 0$. Thus indeed we have $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4) \in C(\lambda)$, and the proof is complete. □

Remark 5.34. Essentially, Theorem 5.33 says that on the cone, if $\lambda \notin \{-3, -4\}$, then

$$\mathcal{H}^{2+4}_{-6-\lambda} \cong \mathcal{H}^3_\lambda \oplus (\mathcal{H}^2_{-6-\lambda} \oplus \mathcal{H}^4_{-6-\lambda}),$$

where the notation should be self-explanatory.

In the next result, we use Theorem 5.33 and Proposition 5.30 to identify precisely when the index of $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ can change.

Theorem 5.35. *The index of $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ can only change as we cross a rate λ if λ is a* critical rate *of $\mathfrak{D}$ in the sense of Definition 5.28. Each such critical rate either changes* $\ker \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ *or* $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$*, but not both.*

Proof. Since $\ker \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda} = \mathcal{H}^3_\lambda$, Lemma 4.27 says that $\ker \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ can only change at a critical rate for $\mathfrak{D}$. Now consider $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$. By Proposition 5.30, the cokernel will only change as we cross the rate λ if there exist new elements of $\ker(d + d^*)_{-6-\lambda}$ that are in $\Omega^2 \oplus \Omega^4$ but are *transverse* to the subspace $\mathcal{H}^2_{-6-\lambda} \oplus \mathcal{H}^4_{-6-\lambda}$. By again using Lemma 4.27, we know that such elements must be asymptotic at the i^{th} end to forms of degree $2 + 4$ on the cone C_i, homogeneous of rate $-6 - \lambda$, which are in the kernel of $d + d^*_{C_i}$, but which are *transverse* to the spaces of closed and coclosed 2-forms and closed and coclosed 4-forms on C_i of rate $-6 - \lambda$. In the notation introduced prior to Theorem 5.33, this corresponds to rates λ for which the quotient space $A(\lambda)/B(\lambda)$ is nonzero for some asymptotic cone C_i. If $\lambda \notin \{-3, -4\}$, then Theorem 5.33 says that this quotient $A(\lambda)/B(\lambda)$ is $C(\lambda)$, and thus by Remark 5.32 such a λ is a critical rate of $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$. For $\lambda \in \{-3, -4\}$, Theorem 5.33 tells us that $C(\lambda) \subseteq B(\lambda)$, so these rates cannot contribute to changes in $\operatorname{coker}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda})$. In fact, we know exactly how these rates change $\ker(\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}) = \mathcal{H}^3_\lambda$ by Proposition 4.34.

Finally, the second statement of the theorem now follows immediately from Theorem 4.21, since every critical rate for $\mathfrak{D}$ is a critical rate for $d + d^*$, and the Lockhart–McOwen index change formulas (64) and (65) show that only one of $\ker(d + d^*)$ or $\operatorname{coker}(d + d^*)$ can change at each critical rate. □

We are now in a position to prove our index change formula for the operator $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$.

Theorem 5.36. *Let $\nu < \mu$ be two* noncritical rates *for $\mathfrak{D}$ on M. Then the difference in the indices of $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\nu}$ and $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\mu}$ is given by*

$$\operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,\mu}) - \operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,\nu}) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{D}_C} \cap (\nu,\mu)} \dim \mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{\mathfrak{D}_C}. \qquad \textit{(AC)} \qquad (142)$$

$$\operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,\mu}) - \operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,\nu}) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{D}_{C_i}} \cap (\nu_i,\mu_i)} \dim \mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{\mathfrak{D}_{C_i}}. \qquad \textit{(CS)} \qquad (143)$$

Proof. From Theorem 5.35, either the kernel or the cokernel of $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ will change at each critical rate of $\mathfrak{D}$. In the AC case, as λ increases, the kernel can either increase or the cokernel can decrease, and in each case the integer by which these dimensions change is exactly $\dim \mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{\mathfrak{D}_C}$. Thus the change in $\operatorname{ind} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda} = \dim \ker \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda} - \dim \operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ at a critical rate λ of $\mathfrak{D}$ is exactly $\dim \mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{\mathfrak{D}_C}$. In the CS case, the only difference is that we have n ends and the kernel decreases (or cokernel increases) as the rate increases. □

Using Theorem 5.36, we can finally compute the virtual dimension v-dim $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ of the moduli space. The first step is to compute the index of $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ exactly in some special cases. Recall from Corollary 4.30 and Proposition 4.34 we have, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-3+\varepsilon} &= b^3_{\text{cs}} + \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^3) \\ \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{\lambda} &= b^3_{\text{cs}},\ \lambda \in (-4,-3) \\ \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-4-\varepsilon} &= b^3_{\text{cs}} - \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^4) \end{aligned}\right\} \text{(AC)}, \qquad \left.\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-3+\varepsilon} &= b^3 - \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^3) \\ \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{\lambda} &= b^3,\ \lambda \in (-4,-3) \\ \dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-4-\varepsilon} &= b^3 + \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^4) \end{aligned}\right\} \text{(CS)}, \quad (144)$$

where $b^3 = \dim H^3(M,\mathbb{R})$ and $b^3_{\mathrm{cs}} = \dim H^3_{\mathrm{cs}}(M)$ are the ordinary and compactly supported third Betti numbers of M, respectively. The above equations say that the rates $\lambda = -3$ and $\lambda = -4$ contribute to changes in the *kernel* of $\mathfrak{D}$, not the cokernel. This fact also follows from Theorem 5.33, as we stated during the proof of Theorem 5.35, but the above equations tell us exactly how the kernel (and thus the index) changes at these rates.

Proposition 5.37. *The index of $\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ is purely topological for a certain range of rates, as follows.*

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,-3+\varepsilon}) &= b^3_{\mathrm{cs}} + \dim(\operatorname{im}\Upsilon^3) \\ \operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}) &= b^3_{\mathrm{cs}},\ \lambda \in (-4,-3) \\ \operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,-4-\varepsilon}) &= b^3_{\mathrm{cs}} - \dim(\operatorname{im}\Upsilon^4) \end{aligned}\right\}\ \textit{(AC)}, \qquad \left.\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,-3+\varepsilon}) &= b^3 - \dim(\operatorname{im}\Upsilon^3) \\ \operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}) &= b^3,\ \lambda \in (-4,-3) \\ \operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,-4-\varepsilon}) &= b^3 + \dim(\operatorname{im}\Upsilon^4) \end{aligned}\right\}\ \textit{(CS)},$$

Proof. By Proposition 4.18 and Proposition 5.30 (b), the space $\operatorname{coker}(\mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}) = \{0\}$ if $-6-\lambda < -\frac{5}{2}$ (AC) or if $-6-\lambda > -\frac{5}{2}$ (CS). This corresponds to $\lambda > -\frac{7}{2}$ (AC) or $\lambda < -\frac{7}{2}$ (CS). Moreover, we know that the index cannot change at all in the interval $(-4,-3)$ since by Corollary 4.28 there are no critical rates for $\mathfrak{D}$ in this interval. Finally, the cokernel *does not* change at the rates -4 and -3, and the change in the kernel at those rates is given by (144). When these facts are all combined we get the statements above. □

Corollary 5.38. *For generic rates ν, the virtual dimension* v-dim $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ *of the* G_2 *conifold moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is as follows.*

- *In the asymptotically conical (AC) case, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{v-dim}\,\mathcal{M}_\nu &= b^3_{\mathrm{cs}} - \dim(\operatorname{im}\Upsilon^4) - \sum_{\lambda\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{D}_C}\cap(\nu,-4)} \dim\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{\mathfrak{D}_C}, && \nu < -4; \\ \dim\mathcal{M}_\nu &= b^3_{\mathrm{cs}}, && \nu \in (-4,-3); \\ \dim\mathcal{M}_\nu &= b^3_{\mathrm{cs}} + \dim(\operatorname{im}\Upsilon^3) + \sum_{\lambda\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{D}_C}\cap(-3,\nu)} \dim\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{\mathfrak{D}_C}, && \nu \in (-3,-\tfrac{5}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

  Note that when $\nu \in (-4,-\frac{5}{2})$, the deformation problem is unobstructed, so the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is a smooth manifold, and the virtual dimension is *the actual dimension of $\mathcal{M}_\nu$.*

- *In the conically singular (CS) case, we have*

$$\text{v-dim}\,\mathcal{M}_\nu = \dim(\operatorname{im}(H^3_{\mathrm{cs}} \to H^3)) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\lambda\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{D}_{C_i}}\cap(-3,\nu_i)} \dim\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{\mathfrak{D}_{C_i}},$$

  where each $\nu_i > 0$.

Proof. This is immediate from Proposition 5.37 and equation (128), along with Theorem 5.36. In the CS case we have also used equation (71). □

Note that in general there are both *topological* and *analytic* contributions to the virtual dimension.

Remark 5.39. The moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ of AC deformations has to always be at least 1-dimensional, because we can always deform an AC G_2 manifold by scaling the entire G_2 structure and then reparametrizing the r coordinate on the asymptotic end. Such a deformation corresponds to a 3-form of the form $\mathcal{L}_X\varphi_C - 3\varphi_C$ where X is a vector field on M that is asymptotic to the dilation vector field. Note that in particular this observation, together with our dimension formula from Corollary 5.38 implies topological restrictions on AC G_2 manifolds.

We close this section by observing that we can improve our dimension formula in the CS case.

Proposition 5.40. *In the CS case, the virtual dimension formula of Corollary 5.38 can be improved to*

$$\text{v-dim}\,\mathcal{M}_\nu \,=\, \dim(\mathrm{im}(H^3_{\mathrm{cs}} \to H^3)) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{\lambda\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{D}_{C_i}}\cap(-3,\nu_i)} \dim\mathcal{K}(\lambda)_{\mathfrak{D}_{C_i}} + n,$$

where n is the number of conical singularities.

Proof. We always get a contribution to the closed and coclosed 3-forms of rate 0 coming from the scalar multiples of the initial torsion-free G_2 structure on the cone C itself. This infinitesimal deformation corresponds to a reparametrization of the conical model for the singularity, since we are always free to rescale the nearly Kähler structure on Σ and not affect the G_2 cone. This means that, in the CS case, these forms, on each asymptotic cone, do not subtract from the number of infinitesimal deformations of a CS G_2 conifold in Corollary 5.38, since there are no corresponding deformations of the conifold corresponding to these static deformations of the cones, but rather they add to the obstruction space though in such a way as to be ineffective. Therefore, overall we have shown that we can modify our expected dimension formula in Corollary 5.38 for the CS moduli space by adding 1 for each singularity as they only give potential obstructions that do not bar any deformations of the CS conifold and thus may be ruled out. $\square$

6 Applications and open problems

In this section we present several applications of our results, and discuss some open problems.

6.1 The spectrum of the Laplacian on Gray manifolds

We first need to discuss some results about the spectrum of the Laplacian on 2-forms, for compact Gray manifolds, that is, for 6-dimensional strictly nearly Kähler manifolds. These results are required for the applications in Sections 6.2 and 6.3. The current section has a different flavour from the rest of the paper. Readers who are only interested in the use of these results for the applications can just note Theorem 6.1 and Proposition 6.2.

Much of this discussion and the relevant calculations can be found (at least implicitly if not explicitly) in [33]. We need to modify the arguments in [33] slightly, so we collect them here for completeness. Note that in [33], the form $\Psi^+ + i\Psi^-$ corresponds to our $-\Omega = -\mathrm{Re}(\Omega) - i\mathrm{Im}(\Omega)$.

Let $(\Sigma, J, \omega, \Omega)$ be a Gray manifold, so in particular from (30) we have

$$d\omega \,=\, -3\,\mathrm{Re}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad d\mathrm{Im}(\Omega) \,=\, 2\,\omega^2. \tag{145}$$

Recall from Lemma 5.29 that the closed and coclosed 3-forms $\gamma = r^\lambda(r^3\alpha_3 + r^2 dr\wedge\alpha_2)$ on the cone, homogeneous of order λ, correspond to *coclosed* (in fact coexact, if $\lambda \neq -4$) 2-forms α_2 on the link that satisfy $\Delta_\Sigma\alpha_2 = (\lambda+3)(\lambda+4)\alpha_2$. From Corollary 5.38, we are particularly interested in such forms for $\lambda \in (-3, 0]$, in which case $0 < (\lambda+3)(\lambda+4) \leq 12$, with equality if and only if $\lambda = 0$. This motivates us to study on Σ the pair of equations

$$\Delta\xi \,=\, \mu\xi \quad \text{and} \quad d^*\xi \,=\, 0 \tag{146}$$

for $\mu \in (0, 12]$ and ξ a section of $\Lambda^2(T^*\Sigma)$.

We can decompose the bundle of real 2-forms on Σ into SU(3) representations as follows:

$$\Lambda^2(T^*\Sigma) \,=\, \Lambda^{(2,0)+(0,2)}(T^*\Sigma) \oplus \Lambda^{(1,1)}_0(T^*\Sigma) \oplus \mathbb{R}\langle\omega\rangle,$$

where

$$T\Sigma \,\cong\, \Lambda^{(2,0)+(0,2)}T^*\Sigma \quad \text{via} \quad X \mapsto X \lrcorner\, \mathrm{Re}(\Omega).$$

We may then write any section ξ of $\Lambda^2 T^*\Sigma$ as

$$\xi \,=\, X \lrcorner\, \mathrm{Re}(\Omega) + \gamma + f\omega \tag{147}$$

for X a vector field on Σ, γ a section of $\Lambda^{(1,1)}_0 T^*\Sigma$, and a smooth function f. From [33, page 253], we will need that

$$JX \,=\, *((X \lrcorner\, \mathrm{Re}(\Omega)) \wedge \mathrm{Re}(\Omega)). \tag{148}$$

It is well known (see [8]) that any oriented hypersurface in a G_2 manifold is endowed with an SU(3) structure $(g', J', \omega', \Omega')$ such that

$$d(\mathrm{Re}(\Omega')) \,=\, 0 \quad \text{and} \quad d(\omega' \wedge \omega') \,=\, 0,$$

which is also called a *half-flat* SU(3) structure.

As we have seen, closed and coclosed 3-forms define infinitesimal deformations of a torsion-free G_2 structure. Thus, the closed and coclosed 3-form

$$\frac{1}{\lambda+3} r^\lambda (r^3 d\xi + r^2 dr \wedge (\lambda+3)\xi)$$

on the cone C over Σ defines an infinitesimal deformation of the torsion-free G_2 structure

$$\varphi_C \,=\, r^3 \mathrm{Re}(\Omega) - r^2 dr \wedge \omega$$

on the cone C, which induces an infinitesimal deformation of the SU(3) structure on Σ. Moreover, the observation that hypersurfaces in G_2 manifolds inherit a half-flat SU(3) structure implies that the infinitesimal deformation of the SU(3) structure on Σ must be an infinitesimal deformation as a half-flat SU(3) structure. Now the infinitesimal variation $\dot\omega$ of ω is given by $-\xi$ and the infinitesimal variation $\mathrm{Re}(\dot\Omega)$ of $\mathrm{Re}\Omega$ is given by $\frac{1}{\lambda+3} d\xi$. Now if we take the infinitesimal variations of the equations

$$d(\omega \wedge \omega) \,=\, 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \omega \wedge \mathrm{Re}(\Omega) \,=\, 0,$$

we find that $d\omega \wedge \xi = -\omega \wedge d\xi$ and thus that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \,&=\, -\xi \wedge \mathrm{Re}(\Omega) + \omega \wedge \frac{1}{\lambda+3} d\xi \\ &=\, -\xi \wedge \mathrm{Re}(\Omega) - \frac{1}{\lambda+3} d\omega \wedge \xi \\ &=\, -\xi \wedge \left(\mathrm{Re}(\Omega) + \frac{1}{\lambda+3} d\omega\right) \\ &=\, -\xi \wedge \frac{\lambda}{\lambda+3} \mathrm{Re}(\Omega) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (145). Using (147) and comparing types, we find that for $\lambda \neq 0$ we have

$$(X \lrcorner \operatorname{Re}(\Omega)) \wedge \operatorname{Re}(\Omega) \,=\, 0,$$

which implies $X = 0$ by (148).

We also know that the closed and coclosed 3-forms on the cone, homogeneous of order $\lambda = 0$ define infinitesimal deformations of the *conical* torsion-free G_2 structure, and hence infinitesimal deformations of the nearly Kähler structure on Σ. By the work of Moroianu–Nagy–Semmelmann [32, Theorem 4.1], we know that such deformations are parametrized, once the scale is fixed, by coclosed primitive $(1,1)$-forms that are eigenforms of the Hermitian Laplace operator with eigenvalue 12. The scaling is given by multiples of ω and Ω, so we can conclude that $X = 0$ for $\lambda = 0$ as well.

Now using $X = 0$, from (147) we find that

$$\begin{aligned} d^*\xi \,&=\, - * d * \xi \,=\, - * d\left(*\gamma + \frac{1}{2} f\omega^2 \right) \\ &=\, - * \left(d * \gamma + \frac{1}{2} df \wedge \omega^2 \right) \\ &=\, -J df + d^*\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude that $d^*\xi = 0$ if and only if

$$d^*\gamma \,=\, J df. \tag{149}$$

Following [33], define the Hermitian connection $\bar{\nabla}$ by $\bar{\nabla}_X = \nabla_X - \frac{1}{2} A_X$, and define $\bar{\Delta}$, the *Hermitian Laplace operator*, explicitly via the formula $\bar{\Delta} = \bar{\nabla}^* \bar{\nabla} + q(\bar{R})$ where $\bar{R}$ is the curvature tensor of $\bar{\nabla}$, and $q(\bar{R})$ is the associated curvature operator. Then the fundamental formula [33, equation (17)] states that for a section γ of $\Lambda_0^{(1,1)} T^*\Sigma$, we have

$$(\Delta - \bar{\Delta})\gamma \,=\, -(J d^*\gamma) \lrcorner \operatorname{Re}(\Omega). \tag{150}$$

It is straightforward to see from a minor modification of the proofs of [33, Lemma 4.6 & 4.10], to account for the fact that f is not necessarily an eigenfunction of the Laplacian, that

$$\Delta(f\omega) \,=\, (\Delta f + 12 f)\omega + 2 df \lrcorner \operatorname{Re}(\Omega). \tag{151}$$

Finally, we deduce from equations (150), and (151) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\xi \,&=\, \Delta(\gamma + f\omega) \\ &=\, \bar{\Delta}\gamma + (\Delta - \bar{\Delta})\gamma + \Delta(f\omega) \\ &=\, \bar{\Delta}\gamma - (J d^*\gamma) \lrcorner \operatorname{Re}(\Omega) + (\Delta f + 12 f)\omega + 2 df \lrcorner \operatorname{Re}(\Omega) \\ &=\, (-J d^*\gamma + 2 df) \lrcorner \operatorname{Re}(\Omega) + \bar{\Delta}\gamma + (\Delta f + 12 f)\omega. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by decomposing into types, we find that the eigenvalue equation $\Delta\xi = \mu\xi$ is equivalent to the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} -J d^*\gamma + 2 df \,&=\, 0, \\ \bar{\Delta}\gamma \,&=\, \mu\gamma, \\ \Delta f + 12 f \,&=\, \mu f. \end{aligned} \tag{152}$$

Substituting (149) into (152) and we find that $df = 0$, $d^*\gamma = 0$, $\bar{\Delta}\gamma = \mu\gamma$, and $\Delta f = (\mu - 12)f$. In particular we have $f = 0$ if $\mu < 12$, and $f = c$ is constant otherwise.

In summary, we have proved the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1. *Let ξ be as in* (147)*, and suppose that ξ satisfies $d^*\xi = 0$ and $\Delta\xi = \mu\xi$ for some $\mu \in (0, 12]$. Then $X = 0$ and $f = c$ is a constant, and $c = 0$ if $\mu \neq 12$. The form $\xi = c\omega + \gamma$ satisfies $d^*\xi = d^*\gamma = 0$ and $\bar{\Delta}\gamma = \mu\gamma$.*

Next, we need to observe that the calculations in [33] enable us to determine the eigenvalues (and their multiplicities) in $(0, 12]$ for $\bar{\Delta}$ acting on coclosed forms in $\Lambda_0^{(1,1)}(T^*\Sigma)$ for the three known Gray manifolds $\Sigma = \mathbb{CP}^3$, $S^3 \times S^3$ and $\mathrm{SU}(3)/T^2$.

Case 1: Let us start with the case of $\mathbb{CP}^3$, which follows from the work in [33, §5.5]. Let E denote the usual representation of $\mathrm{SU}(2)$ on $\mathbb{C}^2$ and let $\mathbb{C}_l$ be the $\mathrm{U}(1)$ representation on $\mathbb{C}$ given by multiplication by z^l for z in the unit circle in $\mathbb{C}$. Let $E_{k,l} = \mathrm{Sym}^k(E) \otimes \mathbb{C}_l$ for $k \geq 1$ and $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $k \equiv l \bmod 2$, which are the irreducible representations of $\mathrm{U}(2)$. From [33, Lemma 5.8] and the discussion before it, we have decompositions

$$T^*\mathbb{CP}^3 \;\cong\; E_{0,-2} \oplus E_{1,1} \oplus E_{0,2} \oplus E_{1,-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_0^{(1,1)}(T^*\mathbb{CP}^3) \;\cong\; E_{0,0} \oplus E_{1,3} \oplus E_{1,-3} \oplus E_{2,0}.$$

If $V_{a,b}$ is an irreducible $\mathrm{SO}(5)$ representation with highest weight (a, b) for $a \geq b \geq 0$, it corresponds to a possible eigenspace of $\bar{\Delta}$ on $\Lambda_0^{(1,1)}(T^*\mathbb{CP}^3)$ with eigenvalue $2(a(a+3) + b(b+1))$ if there is a homomorphism from $V_{a,b}$ to $\Lambda_0^{(1,1)}(T^*\mathbb{CP}^3)$. So the only possible positive eigenvalue less than 12 is 8 for $(a, b) = (1, 0)$. However, since $V_{1,0} \cong T^*(\mathbb{CP}^3)$ we see that there are no such homomorphisms from $V_{1,0}$ to $\Lambda_0^{(1,1)}(T^*\mathbb{CP}^3)$, and thus the lowest possible positive eigenvalue is 12. Moreover, the multiplicity of the possible eigenvalue 12 on coclosed forms in $\Lambda_0^{(1,1)}(T^*\mathbb{CP}^3)$ is shown to be 0 in [33, p. 18], so there are no solutions of (146) for $\mu \in (0, 12]$ on $\mathbb{CP}^3$ other than $\xi = c\omega$.

Case 2: Next we consider the case of $S^3 \times S^3$ as in [33, §5.4]. If E is as above, then by [33, Lemma 5.5],

$$\Lambda_0^{(1,1)}(T^*(S^3 \times S^3)) \;\cong\; \mathrm{Sym}^2(E) \oplus \mathrm{Sym}^4(E).$$

Then the irreducible representation of $\mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{SU}(2)$ given by

$$V_{a,b,c} \;=\; \mathrm{Sym}^a(E) \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^b(E) \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^c(E)$$

for $a, b, c \geq 0$ corresponds to a possible eigenspace of $\bar{\Delta}$ of eigenvalue $\frac{3}{2}(a(a+2)+b(b+2)+c(c+2))$ if there is a homomorphism from $V_{a,b,c}$ to $\Lambda_0^{(1,1)}(T^*(S^3 \times S^3))$. The only possible positive eigenvalues less than 12 are $\frac{9}{2}$ and 9 for $(a, b, c) = (1, 0, 0)$ and for $(a, b, c) = (1, 1, 0)$, respectively, up to permutation. There are no homomorphisms from $V_{1,0,0} = \mathrm{Sym}^1(E)$ to $\mathrm{Sym}^2(E) \oplus \mathrm{Sym}^4(E)$, but there *is* one from $V_{1,1,0} = \mathrm{Sym}^1(E) \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^1(E) = \mathrm{Sym}^0(E) \oplus \mathrm{Sym}^2(E)$ to $\mathrm{Sym}^2(E) \oplus \mathrm{Sym}^4(E)$. However, the fact that $\mathrm{Sym}^0(E)$ is a factor in $V_{1,1,0}$ means that $V_{1,1,0}$ also corresponds to an eigenspace for Δ on functions with eigenvalue 9, and such functions, by [33, Proposition 4.11], define elements of $\Lambda_0^{(1,1)}(T^*(S^3 \times S^3))$ that are eigenforms of $\bar{\Delta}$ with eigenvalue 12 but which are *not* coclosed, as the eigenvalue is not 6. We hence deduce that 9 does not arise as an eigenvalue for $\bar{\Delta}$ acting on coclosed forms in $\Lambda_0^{(1,1)}(T^*(S^3 \times S^3))$. Moreover, the multiplicity of the possible eigenvalue 12 on coclosed forms in $\Lambda_0^{(1,1)}(T^*(S^3 \times S^3))$ is shown to be 0 in [33, p. 16], so again there are no solutions of (146) for $\mu \in (0, 12]$ on $S^3 \times S^3$ other than $\xi = c\omega$.

Case 3: Finally, we consider the case of $\mathrm{SU}(3)/T^2$ as in [33, §5.6]. Let E denote the usual representation of $\mathrm{SU}(3)$ on $\mathbb{C}^3$ and let

$$V_{k,l} \,=\, \ker(\mathrm{Sym}^k(E) \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^l(\bar{E}) \to \mathrm{Sym}^{k-1}(E) \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^{l-1}(\bar{E})),$$

where the map is the contraction map. If ε_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ is the standard basis on $\mathbb{R}^3$ then the weights of $V_{k,l}$ are

$$(a - a')\varepsilon_1 + (b - b')\varepsilon_2 + (c - c')\varepsilon_3$$

where $k = a + b + c$, $l = a' + b' + c'$ and $a, b, c, a', b', c' \geq 0$. The representation $V_{k,l}$ corresponds to a possible eigenvalue of $2(k(k + 2) + l(l + 2))$ of $\bar{\Delta}$. So we need $(k, l) = (1, 0)$ or $(k, l) = (0, 1)$ for a positive eigenvalue less than 12. Now by [33, Corollary 5.11] the possible weights of the T^2 representation on $\Lambda^{(1,1)}_0(T^*(\mathrm{SU}(3)/T^2))$ are 0 and $\pm 3\varepsilon_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. However, for eigenvalues less than 12 we cannot achieve weights $\pm 3\varepsilon_i$ since $k, l \in \{0, 1\}$ and we cannot achieve weight 0 since $k \neq l$. Thus there are no eigenvalues in $(0, 12)$. Moreover, by the work in [33, §5.6 & §6], the space of solutions to (146) for $\mu \in (0, 12]$ is zero *unless* $\mu = 12$, in which case the solutions are of the form $\xi = c\omega + \gamma$, where the γ's lie in a space of dimension 8, isomorphic to $\mathfrak{su}(3)$.

In summary, we have proved the following result.

Proposition 6.2. *Let Σ be one of the three known Gray manifolds: $\mathbb{CP}^3$, $S^3 \times S^3$, or $\mathrm{SU}(3)/T^2$. There are no non-trivial coclosed primitive $(1,1)$-forms which are eigenforms of the Hermitian Laplace operator $\bar{\Delta}$ with eigenvalue in $(0, 12)$. Moreover, in the first two cases, we can also exclude the eigenvalue 12. For the flag manifold $\mathrm{SU}(3)/T^2$, we get an 8-dimensional space of such forms with eigenvalue 12. These forms correspond to infinitesimal deformations of the nearly Kähler structure, for which it is still not known whether or not they can be integrated to actual deformations.*

6.2 Local uniqueness of the Bryant–Salamon manifolds

Let us apply Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.38 to the three known examples of AC G_2 manifolds, the Bryant–Salamon manifolds of Example 3.16. The manifolds $\Lambda^2_-(S^4)$ and $\Lambda^2_-(\mathbb{CP}^2)$ are of rate $\nu = -4$ and the manifold $\not{S}(S^3)$ is of rate $\nu = -3$. Since -4 and -3 are excluded in Theorem 5.1, we can only describe their deformations as AC G_2 manifolds of rate $\nu + \varepsilon$. For the first two examples, we find that the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{-4+\varepsilon}$ is a smooth manifold of dimension $b^3_{\mathrm{cs}} = b^4 = 1$. (Recall by Remark 5.39 that the dimension has to be at least one.)

For $N = \not{S}(S^3)$, we find that the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{-3+\varepsilon}$ is a smooth manifold of dimension $b^3_{\mathrm{cs}} + \dim(\operatorname{im}\Upsilon^3) = b^4 + \dim(\operatorname{im}\Upsilon^3) = 0 + \dim(\operatorname{im}\Upsilon^3)$. A simple diagram chase in (70) using the facts that $H^3(\Sigma) = \mathbb{R}^2$, $H^4_{\mathrm{cs}}(N) = \mathbb{R}$, and $H^4(N) = \{0\}$ gives $\dim(\operatorname{im}\Upsilon^3) = 1$.

That is, the Bryant–Salamon manifolds are *rigid*, or "locally unique" as AC G_2 manifolds of rate $\nu + \varepsilon$, modulo the scalings which are always present.

In fact, however, we can say much more. We can conclude that the Bryant–Salamon G_2 conifolds are locally unique (modulo scalings) as AC G_2 manifolds, *all the way up to* $\nu < 0$. The argument is as follows. Consider the proof of Theorem 5.12. The demonstration that we have a decomposition

$$T_\varphi \mathcal{T}_{l,\nu} \,=\, T_\varphi(\mathcal{D}_{l+1,\nu+1} \cdot \varphi) + T_\varphi \mathcal{M}_{l,\nu}.$$

works all the way up to $\nu < 0$. We only needed the assumption that $\nu \leq -1$ to prove that the sum was direct. However, this just means that the solutions to (99) *include* all gauge-fixed torsion-free G_2 structures, for any $\nu < 0$. Since Theorem 5.14 says that the solutions to (100) include the solutions to (99) for any $\nu < 0$, we conclude that the gauge-fixed torsion-free G_2 structures of rate ν are a subset of the solutions to (100), for any $\nu < 0$.

Let $\nu \in (-3, 0)$. By Corollary 5.24, since the obstruction space $\mathcal{O}_\nu = \{0\}$ for $\nu > -4$, we know that solutions to (100) are locally diffeomorphic to $\mathcal{H}^3_\nu$. Now suppose that the interval $(-3, 0)$ contains no critical rates for $d + d^*_C$ on 3-forms on the cone. This means that $\mathcal{H}^3_\nu = \mathcal{H}^3_{-3+\varepsilon}$ for any $\nu \in (-3, 0)$. Since solutions of (99) are a subset of solutions of (100) and solutions to (99) can only increase or stay the same as we increase ν, we find that solutions to (99) must stay the same for all $\nu \in (-3, 0)$. We summarize our conclusion in the following proposition.

Proposition 6.3. *Let (M, φ) be an AC G_2 manifold of rate $\nu \in (-3, 0)$, with asymptotic G_2 cone C. Suppose that the interval $(-3, 0)$ contains no critical rates for $\mathfrak{D}_C$ on 3-forms on the cone. Then the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ of AC deformations of M, asymptotic to the same cone C at the same rate ν, is a smooth manifold of dimension $\dim \mathcal{H}^3_{-3+\varepsilon}$.*

Corollary 6.4. *The Bryant–Salamon G_2 conifolds are locally unique, modulo scalings, as AC G_2 manifolds with the same asymptotic cones, up to any rate $-\varepsilon < 0$.*

Proof. For $\slashed{S}(S^3)$ this is immediate from Proposition 6.4 and the earlier discussion. For the cases $\Lambda^2_-(S^4)$ and $\Lambda^2_-(\mathbb{CP}^2)$, we have to use the fact that there are no new deformations as we cross $\lambda = -3$, arising from the term $\dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^3)$ in Corollary 5.38. But this is immediate since $H^3(\Sigma) = \{0\}$ for both these manifolds, and thus $\Upsilon^3 = 0$. $\square$

It was a priori possible that, while the Bryant–Salamon manifolds are rigid modulo scalings for rates up to $\nu + \varepsilon$, that for greater (less negative) rates, there could exist deformations of these AC G_2 manifolds that break the symmetry and yield new AC holonomy G_2 manifolds. Corollary 6.4 says that this *does not happen*, and it is essentially due to the absence of critical rates for $\mathfrak{D}_C$ on the cone C in the interval $(-3, 0)$.

Remark 6.5. In general when there are no such critical rates, we have succeeded in pushing the range of validity of Theorem 5.1 from $\nu < -\frac{5}{2}$ all the way to $\nu < 0$. It would be quite interesting if one could prove that such a statement is true for *any* Gray manifold. That is, if the part of Proposition 6.2 corresponding to $\mu \neq 12$ could be shown to be true for any Gray manifold, then our Theorem 5.1 could be extended from $\nu < -\frac{5}{2}$ to $\nu < 0$.

6.3 Smoothness of the CS moduli space for certain cones

In this section we establish that the CS moduli space is in fact *smooth* if the singularities are all modeled on G_2 cones satisfying certain conditions. This includes two of the known G_2 cones, and may include the third as well.

Lemma 6.6. *Let M be a CS G_2 manifold. Suppose that* for each end*, the associated G_2 cone C_i is such that there are no critical rates for the operator $\mathfrak{D}_{C_i}$ in the interval $(-3, 0)$. Then the space* $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ *described in Proposition 5.30(b) is zero for all $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) < 0$.*

Proof. From Theorem 5.35, and the hypotheses, we know that for any $\lambda < 0$, we have $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda} = \operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,-3+\varepsilon}$. As we cross the rate $\lambda = -3$, the argument at the end of the second paragraph of the proof of Theorem 5.35 says that $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda}$ still does not change. Corollary 4.28 then allows us to conclude that $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,\lambda} = \operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,-4+\varepsilon}$ for any $\lambda < 0$. Now Remark 5.31 can be applied in the CS case, with all inequalities reversed, to conclude that $\operatorname{coker} \mathfrak{D}_{l,-4+\varepsilon} = \{0\}$, since $-4 + \varepsilon < -\frac{7}{2}$. $\square$

By Theorem 6.1, *for each end*, the closed and coclosed 3-forms on the cone C_i correspond to 2-forms $\xi = c\omega + \gamma$, where $\bar{\Delta}\gamma = 12\gamma$. By the work of Moroianu–Nagy–Semmelmann [32, Theorem 4.1], the form γ corresponds to an infinitesimal deformation of the nearly Kähler structure on the link Σ_i.

Theorem 6.7. *Let M be as in Lemma 6.6, and choose $\nu > 0$ close enough to zero so that there are no other critical rates between 0 and ν. Suppose further that each link has no infinitesimal deformations as a Gray manifold. Then the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ of deformations of M as a CS G_2 manifold is* smooth, *with dimension*

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_\nu \,=\, \dim(\mathrm{im}(H^3_{\mathrm{cs}} \to H^3)).$$

Proof. This is immediate from Lemma 6.6, Corollary 5.38, and the discussion in Section 6.1. □

Corollary 6.8. *Let M be a CS G_2 manifold of rate $\nu = 0 + \varepsilon$, all of whose conical singularities are modeled on G_2 cones whose links are either $\mathbb{CP}^3$ or $S^3 \times S^3$. Then the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ of CS deformations of M with rate ν is a smooth manifold.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 6.7 and Proposition 6.2. □

6.4 Relation with the moduli of resolved CS G_2 manifolds

In this section we relate our results to the resolution of singularities construction of [18]. Our observations provide evidence that CS G_2 manifolds likely arise as the "most common" form of singular object in any attempt to compactify the moduli space of compact smooth G_2 manifolds.

Let M be a CS G_2 manifold with one conical singularity and let N be an AC G_2 manifold asymptotic to the same G_2 cone, with link Σ, at infinity as M has at its singularity. The main result of [18] says that, if a particular necessary topological condition [18, Theorem 3.8] is satisfied, then one can *desingularize* M by gluing in N to obtain a compact *smooth* G_2 manifold, which we will denote by X. For one conical singularity, the topological condition can be expressed using the maps Υ^k of Definition 4.31 as follows:

$$\Upsilon^3_N(\varphi_{{}_N}) \,\in\, \mathrm{im}(\Upsilon^3_M), \qquad\qquad \Upsilon^4_N(\psi_{{}_N}) \,\in\, \mathrm{im}(\Upsilon^4_M). \tag{153}$$

Remark 6.9. In [18, Definition 2.40], the elements $\Upsilon^3_N(\varphi_{{}_N})$ and $\Upsilon^4_N(\psi_{{}_N})$ are denoted by $\Phi(N)$ and $\Psi(N)$, respectively.

Since $X = M \cup N$ and $M \cap N$ is homotopy equivalent to Σ, the Mayer–Vietoris long exact sequence gives

$$\cdots \longrightarrow H^k(X) \longrightarrow H^k(M) \oplus H^k(N) \xrightarrow{\delta^k} H^k(\Sigma) \longrightarrow H^{k+1}(X) \longrightarrow \cdots \tag{154}$$

where the map $\delta^k : H^k(M) \oplus H^k(N) \to H^k(\Sigma)$ is given by $\delta^k(a) = \Upsilon^k_M(a) - \Upsilon^k_N(a)$, and the Υ^k maps are those of Definition 4.31.

Lemma 6.10. *Let M, N, X, and Σ be as above. The following equation holds.*

$$\begin{aligned} b^k(X) \,=\, & b^k(M) - \dim(\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^k_M) \\ & + b^k_{\mathrm{cs}}(N) - \dim(\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^{7-k}_N) + \dim((\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^{7-k}_M) \cap (\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^{7-k}_N)) \\ & + \dim((\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^k_M) \cap (\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^k_N)). \end{aligned} \tag{155}$$

Proof. We will use the shorthand notation H^k_A for $H^k(A)$. By the rank-nullity theorem we have

$$b^k(X) \;=\; \dim(\ker(H^k_X \to H^k_M \oplus H^k_N)) + \dim(\operatorname{im}(H^k_X \to H^k_m \oplus H^k_N)). \tag{156}$$

The exactness of (154) gives

$$\dim(\operatorname{im}(H^k_X \to H^k_m \oplus H^k_N)) \;=\; \dim(\ker \delta^k), \tag{157}$$

but since $\delta^k = \Upsilon^k_M - \Upsilon^k_N$, it is easy to check that

$$\dim(\ker \delta^k) \;=\; \dim(\ker \Upsilon^k_M) + \dim(\ker \Upsilon^k_N) + \dim((\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^k_M) \cap (\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^k_N)). \tag{158}$$

Substituting (157), and (158) into (156) gives

$$\begin{aligned} b^k(X) \;=\; & \dim(\ker(H^k_X \to H^k_M \oplus H^k_N)) \\ & + \dim(\ker \Upsilon^k_M) + \dim(\ker \Upsilon^k_N) + \dim((\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^k_M) \cap (\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^k_N)). \end{aligned} \tag{159}$$

Again using the exactness of (154), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(\ker(H^k_X \to H^k_M \oplus H^k_N)) \;&=\; \dim(\operatorname{im}(H^{k-1}_\Sigma \to H^k_X)) \\ &=\; b^{k-1}(\Sigma) - \dim(\ker(H^{k-1}_\Sigma \to H^k_X)) \\ &=\; b^{k-1}(\Sigma) - \dim(\operatorname{im} \delta^{k-1}) \\ &=\; \dim(\operatorname{coker} \delta^{k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

But the dimension of this cokernel is equal to the dimension of the kernel of the *adjoint map*, which is a map $(\delta^{k-1})^* : H^{6-(k-1)}(\Sigma) \to H^{7-(k-1)}_{\mathrm{cs}}(M) \oplus H^{7-(k-1)}_{\mathrm{cs}}(N)$. It can be easily checked from the definitions of all the maps involved that $(\delta^{k-1})^*(a) = (\partial^{7-k}_M(a), \partial^{7-k}_N(a))$, where the maps $\partial^k_A : H^k(\Sigma) \to (H^{k+1}_{\mathrm{cs}})(A)$ are the connecting homomorphisms in the long exact sequence (70). Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(\ker(H^k_X \to H^k_M \oplus H^k_N)) \;&=\; \dim(\ker(\delta^{k-1})^*) \\ &=\; \dim((\ker \partial^{7-k}_M) \cap (\ker \partial^{7-k}_N)) \\ &=\; \dim((\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^{7-k}_M) \cap (\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^{7-k}_N)) \end{aligned} \tag{160}$$

where in the last step we have used the exactness of (70) for both M and N.

Finally, we substitute (160) into (159) and use (72) for M and (73) for N to obtain (155). □

Specializing Lemma 6.10 to $k = 3$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} b^3(X) \;=\; & b^3(M) - \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^3_M) \\ & + b^3_{\mathrm{cs}}(N) - \dim(\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^4_N) + \dim((\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^4_M) \cap (\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^4_N)) \\ & + \dim((\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^3_M) \cap (\operatorname{im} \Upsilon^3_N)). \end{aligned} \tag{161}$$

Notice that the left hand side gives the dimension of the moduli space of deformations of the *smooth, compact* G_2 manifold X. Also, by Corollay 5.38 and equation (71) the first two terms on the right hand side give the dimension of the moduli space of deformations of the CS G_2 manifold M, *if this moduli space is unobstructed and their are no analytic contributions to the deformations.* In particular, by the results of Sections 6.2 and 6.3, this is true if there is one conical singularity whose link is either $\mathbb{CP}^3$ or $S^3 \times S^3$.

Let us consider two particular cases.

Case 1. Suppose $b^4(N) = b^3_{\mathrm{cs}}(N) = 1$, $b^3(N) = b^4_{\mathrm{cs}}(N) = 0$, and $b^3(\Sigma) = 0$. Further assume that $\Upsilon^4_N(\psi_N) \neq 0$ in $H^4(\Sigma)$. [In particular, these assumptions all hold for the Bryant–Salamon manifolds $\Lambda^2_-(S^4)$ and $\Lambda^2_-(\mathbb{CP}^2)$, with links $\Sigma = \mathbb{CP}^3$ and $\Sigma = \mathrm{SU}(3)/T^2$, respectively.]

With these assumptions, some simple diagram chasing using the exact sequence (70) gives

$$\Upsilon^3_M = 0, \quad \Upsilon^3_N = 0, \quad \ker(\Upsilon^4_N) = \{0\}, \quad \dim(\mathrm{im}(\Upsilon^4_N)) = 1.$$

The condition (153) in this case thus becomes $\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^4_N = (\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^4_N) \cap (\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^4_M)$, and (161) therefore becomes $b^3(X) = b^3(M) + 1$.

Case 2. Suppose $b^4(N) = b^3_{\mathrm{cs}}(N) = 0$, $b^3(N) = b^4_{\mathrm{cs}}(N) = 1$, and $b^4(\Sigma) = 0$. Further assume that $\Upsilon^3_N(\varphi_N) \neq 0$ in $H^3(\Sigma)$. [In particular, these assumptions all hold for the Bryant–Salamon manifold $\not{S}(S^3)$, with link $\Sigma = S^3 \times S^3$.]

As before, diagram chasing using (70) in this case yields

$$\Upsilon^4_M = 0, \quad \Upsilon^4_N = 0, \quad \ker(\Upsilon^3_N) = \{0\}, \quad \dim(\mathrm{im}(\Upsilon^3_N)) = 1.$$

The condition (153) in this case thus becomes $\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^3_N = (\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^3_N) \cap (\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^3_M)$, and (161) therefore becomes $b^3(X) = b^3(M) = b^3(M) - \dim(\mathrm{im}\,\Upsilon^3_M) + 1$.

In summary, in both cases (which include all the known examples of AC G_2 manifolds), we find that the dimension of the moduli space of glued compact G_2 manifolds that are constructed in [18] is exactly one dimension higher than that of the CS G_2 manifolds which has been resolved, so we can view the CS moduli space almost literally as "the boundary" of the moduli space of compact G_2 manifolds, at least locally.

6.5 Existence of a gauge-fixing diffeomorphism

In [18], a gauge-fixing condition was defined for AC G_2 manifolds that is slightly different from our Definition 2.16. Specifically, an AC G_2 manifold (M, φ_M) comes equipped with a choice of diffeomorphism $h : (R, \infty) \times \Sigma \to N \setminus L$ for some compact subset $L \subset M$ and some $R > 0$, where Σ is the link of the asymptotic G_2 cone. In [18, Definition 3.3], the diffeomorphism h is said to satisfy the gauge-fixing condition if $h^*(\varphi_M) - \varphi_C$ lies in Ω^3_{27} with respect to the G_2 structure φ_C on the cone.

In [18], it was promised that the present paper would give a proof that such a diffeomorphism h can always be chosen to satisfy the gauge-fixing condition. This is a consequence of the slice theorem, adapted to the setting of G_2 cones. That is, we need a version of Theorem 5.13 for G_2 conifolds that have both CS and AC ends. This can be established in the same way, with minor modifications, by adapting the proof of Theorem 5.12. The statement of the existence of a good gauge is as follows.

Proposition 6.11. *Let (M, φ_M) be an AC G_2 manifold, with diffeomorphism $h : (R, \infty) \times \Sigma \to M \setminus L$ as given in Definition 3.14. Then there exists some diffeomorphism $\tilde{h} : (R, \infty) \times \Sigma \to M \setminus L$ such that $\tilde{h}^*(\varphi_M) - \varphi_C$ is in Ω^3_{27} with respect to φ_C.*

Proof. The 3-form $h^*(\varphi_M)$ is a torsion-free G_2 structure on the open subset $C_R = (R, \infty) \times \Sigma$ of C, and the AC condition says that $h^*(\varphi_M)$ is close to the torsion-free G_2 structure φ_C on C_R. By the version of our slice theorem for general G_2 conifolds, there exists a diffeomorphism $f : C_R \to C_R$

such that $\pi_7(d^*[f^*(h^*(\varphi_M))]) = 0$, where d^* and π_7 are taken with respect to φ_C. Define $\tilde{h} = h \circ f$, which is a diffeomorphism from C_R to $M \setminus L$. Then we have shown that $\pi_7(d^*[\tilde{h}^*(\varphi_M) - \varphi_C]) = 0$. Now write the 3-form $\zeta = \tilde{h}^*(\varphi_M) - \varphi_C$ in the form (27). By the proof of Lemma 2.17, the function f and the 1-form X are harmonic, of order $O(r^\nu)$ as $r \to \infty$. By Proposition 3.4, we can conclude that both f and X are of order $O(r^{-4+\varepsilon})$, which implies that both ∇f and ∇X are in L^2 on C_R, and thus by Corollary 2.8 both $f = 0$ and $X = 0$. So $\zeta \in \Omega^3_{27}$ with respect to φ_C, which is what we wanted to show. □

6.6 Open problems

There remain several interesting and important open problems for future study.

- We need to find more examples, especially with little or no symmetry, of Gray manifolds (compact strictly nearly Kähler 6-manifolds). This would provide new examples of G_2 cones, and hopefully from there one can construct new AC G_2 manifolds with these asymptotic cones.

- The work of Moroianu–Nagy–Semmelmann [32] describes in detail the *infinitesimal* deformations of Gray manifolds. It is still an open problem to understand the integrability of such infinitesimal deformations to actual deformations. Understanding this would allow us to consider more general deformations of G_2 conifolds where we allow the asymptotic cones to also deform.

- A related question is to better understand the spectrum of the Laplacian on 2-forms for Gray manifolds. Some work on this already appears in Moroianu–Nagy–Semmelmann [32] and Moroianu–Semmelmann [33]. But a more thorough understanding would allow us to conclude whether the results in Sections 6.2 and 6.3 are more general or are particular to G_2 conifolds whose links are the known Gray manifolds.

- One can define a *stability index* for G_2 cones in a similar way to the stability index for special Lagrangian cones [13] or for coassociative cones [25]. Results about the spectrum of the Laplacian for Gray manifolds would also tell us something about the stability index of G_2 cones. Knowledge of the stability index tells us more about when the CS deformation theory is *unobstructed.*

- We need to construct the first examples of CS G_2 manifolds. As mentioned earlier, the approach in [14] of constructing compact *smooth* G_2 manifolds may possibly be generalizable to construct CS G_2 manifolds.

References

[1] Y. A. Abramovich and C. D. Aliprantis, *An Invitation to Operator Theory*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **50**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.

[2] M. Atiyah and E. Witten, "M-theory dynamics on a manifold of G_2 holonomy", *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **6** (2002), 1–106.

[3] C. Bär, "Real Killing spinors and holonomy", *Comm. Math. Phys.* **154** (1993), 509–521.

[4] A.L. Besse, *Einstein Manifolds*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.

[5] R.L. Bryant, “Some remarks on G_2-structures”, *Proceedings of Gökova Geometry-Topology Conference 2005*, 75–109.

[6] R.L. Bryant and S. Salamon, “On the construction of some complete metrics with exceptional holonomy”, *Duke Math. J.* **58** (1989), 829–850.

[7] J.-B. Butruille, “Classification des carieétés approximativement kähleriennes homogènes”, *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* **27** (2005), 201–225.

[8] S. Chiossi and S. Salamon, “The intrinsic torsion of SU(3) and G_2 structures”, in *Differential geometry, Valencia, 2001*, 115–133, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ.

[9] D.G. Ebin, “The manifold of Riemannian metrics”, 1970 Global Analysis, *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.* **Vol. XV**, (1968), 11–40, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1968.

[10] R. Harvey and H.B. Lawson, “Calibrated geometries”, *Acta Math.* **148** (1982), 47–157.

[11] D. Joyce, *Compact Manifolds with Special Holonomy*, Oxford University Press, 2000.

[12] D. Joyce, “Special Lagrangian submanifolds with isolated conical singularities. I. Regularity”, *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* **25** (2004), 201–251.

[13] D. Joyce, “Special Lagrangian submanifolds with isolated conical singularities. II. Moduli Spaces”, *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* **25** (2004), 301–352.

[14] D. Joyce and S. Karigiannis, “A new construction of compact G_2 manifolds by gluing families of Eguchi–Hanson spaces”, *in preparation.*

[15] S. Karigiannis, “Deformations of G_2 and Spin(7) structures on manifolds”, *Canad. J. Math.* **57** (2005), 1012–1055.

[16] S. Karigiannis, “Some notes on G_2 and Spin(7) geometry”, *Recent Advances in Geometric Analysis*; Advanced Lectures in Mathematics, Vol. 11; International Press, (2010), 129–146.

[17] S. Karigiannis; “Flows of G_2-structures, I.”, *Q. J. Math.* **60** (2009), 487–522.

[18] S. Karigiannis, “Desingularization of G_2 manifolds with isolated conical singularities”, *Geom. Topol.* **13** (2009), 1583–1655.

[19] A. Kovalev, “Twisted connected sums and special Riemannian holonomy”, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **565** (2003), 125–160.

[20] A. Kovalev and J. Nordström, “Asymptotically cylindrical 7-manifolds of holonomy G_2 with applications to compact irreducible G_2-manifolds”, *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* **38** (2010), 221–257.

[21] S. Lang, *Real Analysis*, Addison-Wesley, 1972.

[22] R. B. Lockhart and R. C. McOwen, “Elliptic differential operators on noncompact manifolds”, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)* **12** (1985), 409–447.

[23] R. Lockhart, “Fredholm, Hodge and Liouville theorems on noncompact manifolds”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **301** (1987), 1–35.

[24] J. Lotay, “Calibrated submanifolds and the exceptional geometries”, *Oxford DPhil. Thesis*, 2005. Available at: `http://people.maths.ox.ac.uk/~joyce/theses/theses.html`

[25] J. Lotay, “Coassociative 4-folds with conical singularities”, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **15** (2007), 891–946.

[26] J. Lotay “Deformation theory of asymptotically conical coassociative 4-folds”, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* **99** (2009), 386–424.

[27] J. Lotay, “Asymptotically conical associative 3-folds”, *Q. J. Math.* **62** (2011), 131–156.

[28] J. Lotay and A. Neves, “Uniqueness of Lagrangian self-expanders”. arXiv:1208.2729

[29] S. Marshall, "Deformations of special Lagrangian submanifolds", *Oxford DPhil. Thesis*, 2002. Available at: `http://people.maths.ox.ac.uk/~joyce/theses/theses.html`

[30] V.G. Maz'ya and B. Plamenevskij, "Elliptic boundary value problems", *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.* **123** (1984), 1–56.

[31] R. C. McLean, "Deformations of calibrated submanifolds", *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **6** (1998), 705–747.

[32] A. Moroianu, P.-A. Nagy, and U. Semmelmann, "Deformations of nearly Kähler structures", *Pacific J. Math.* **235** (2008), 57–72.

[33] A. Moroianu and U. Semmelmann, "The Hermitian Laplace operator on nearly Kähler manifolds", *Comm. Math. Phys.* **294** (2010), 251–272.

[34] C. B. Morrey, *Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations*, Grundlehren Series Volume 130, SpringerVerlag, Berlin, 1966.

[35] J. Nordström, "Deformations and gluing of asymptotically cylindrical manifolds with exceptional holonomy", *Cambridge DPhil. Thesis*, 2008. Available at: `http://www2.imperial.ac.uk/~jnordstr/`

[36] J. Nordström, "Deformations of asymptotically cylindrical G_2 manifolds", *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **145** (2008), 311–348.

[37] J. Nordström, "Deformations of glued G_2-manifolds", *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **17** (2009), 481–503.

[38] M. Obata, "Certain conditions for a Riemannian manifold to be isometric with a sphere", *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **14** (1962), 333–340.

[39] T. Pacini, "Deformations of asymptotically conical special Lagrangian submanifolds", *Pacific J. Math.* **215** (2004), 151–181.

[40] T. Pacini, "Special Lagrangian conifolds, I: moduli spaces", *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, to appear.

[41] T. Pacini, "Special Lagrangian conifolds, II: gluing constructions in $\mathbb{C}^m$", *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, to appear.

[42] T. Pacini, "Desingularizing isolated conical singularities: uniform estimates via weighted Sobolev spaces", *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, to appear.

[43] F. Podestà and A. Spiro, "Six-dimensional nearly Kähler manifolds of cohomogeneity one", *J. Geom. Phys.* **60** (2010), 156–164.

[44] F. Podestà and A. Spiro, "Six-dimensional nearly Kähler manifolds of cohomogeneity one (II)", *Comm. Math. Phys.* **312** (2012), 477–500.

[45] R. Reyes-Carrión and S. Salamon, "A survey of nearly Kähler manifolds", (Spanish) *Gac. R. Soc. Mat. Esp.* **2** (1999), 40–49.